



special
collections
DOUGLAS
Library



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

THE
RIGHT
OF
MONARCHY
ASSERTED;
Wherein the
ABSTRACT
OF

Dr. *King's* BOOK,

With the Motives for the Reviving it at
this Juncture are fully considered.

—*Mendacii eum prehendit.* Plaut.

L O N D O N :

Printed, and Sold by John Morphew, near Stationers-Hall. 1713.

RIGHT

OF

MONARCHY

ASSETED

WILLIAM

ABSTRACT

OF

DR. WILSON'S BOOK

AND THE HISTORY OF THE MONARCHY

AND THE HISTORY OF THE MONARCHY

AND THE HISTORY OF THE MONARCHY

AND THE HISTORY OF THE MONARCHY



T H E

P R E F A C E.



WRETCHED is that Cause that is supported by Lies; but very wretched indeed is it, and in an expiring Condition, when a Stale Lie is the only Comfort can be administred to it. And this is the Case of the Poor Whigs at this time; whose Stock seems to be exhausted, that they are forc'd to recur to a Legend of above Twenty Years standing to refresh their Drooping Cause. This infamous Legend having so long lain silent, I believe the Author will not thank these second Editors for republishing it, but rather wish they had let it slept in Oblivion. Had the Abridger of Dr. King's Book ever seen the Answer to it, he must have been convinc'd of the many Errors that Gentleman had led the Age into, before it was reply'd to: Which was the Case some Years ago of some Authors who recite some of the grossest Mistakes of Dr. King's Book; and, from his Credit deliver them for undoubted Truths. And upon the same Mistake does our Abridger introduce Dr. King's Book with the Pompons Character of a Book "Written with so thorough a Knowledge and full Comprehension of the Constitution and Laws of the British Monarchy in general, and of that Coun-

A 2 " try

P R E F A C E.

try in particular, upon such clear and abundant Information of all the Transactions it relates, &c.

I shall not Anticipate what the Reader will find in Answer to all Dr. King hath said, in the following Sheets, to which I refer; But only observe to Dr. King what Advantage some People make of that Doctrine of One Prince interposing between another Prince and his Subjects, when he uses them Cruelly.

That they were more cruelly us'd by K. W. than even Dr. King says.

In Scotland, the Episcopal Party were Fined, Imprisoned, Massacred (as Glencoe, &c.) and put to the Torture against the very Claim of Right (as Nevil Pain, &c.) their Clergy Mobb'd, and Episcopacy abolished: Tho' P. O. in his Declaration to them 10th Oct. 1688. promised to preserve their Church, and makes that the chief End of his Expedition.

That when the meeting of their Three Estates was called by P. O's Circular Letters in March 1689. none were sent to the Royal Burghes in the North of Scotland, which is the most Episcopal and Loyal Part of that and therefore they had no Representatives.

That the Oaths required by Law to be taken by all Members of Parliament, or any Judicature, were laid aside; by which means Persons outlaw'd for Treason and others Incapable were let into the House.

That several Noblemen and Gentlemen, who had been Forefaulted for Treason, and so had no Property in Scotland, were admitted into the Convention, before their Forfeitures were rescinded, and so were made Judgos to pass Sentence of Forefaulture against their Kings. And that one of these (the E. of Argyle) was sent with the Tender of the Crown of Scotland to the Prince and Princess of Orange.

That

P R E F A C E.

That by these Means the Fanaticks grew so numerous in that Convention, that they turn'd out any Episcopal Member that stood in Competition with one of their own.

That by their Act of 4th July 1690. they rescinded all Forefaultures since the Year 1665. particularly Monmouth, and Richard Rumbald. And within this Act were included all the Rebellions of Pentland-Hills, Bothwell-Bridge, Monmouth and Argyle; and the very Assassins of the Arch Bp. of St. Andrews.

That the Presbyterian Managers did instigate the Rabble to drive the Episcopal Clergy from their Churches. That this Rabbling was introduc'd by a Report of some Thousands of Irish landing in Galloway, and marching with Fire and Sword. Upon which the Fanaticks arm'd, and fell upon the Episcopal Clergy with incredible Violence. They drove them from their Churches, plunder'd their Houses, assaulted their Persons, pricking some with Bodkins, &c. till they run Distracted. They turn'd the Wives and Children of the Episcopal Clergy out of their Houses to shift as they could, by which many of their Children dy'd, and several of their Wives miscarried. At Air an Episcopal Clergy-man's Wife, who had been Delivered but Four Days, was with her Children turn'd into the Streets, and all People shut their Doors against them, till at Eleven at Night, one of them (who told me this) procur'd a poor Cabin to shelter them. They lead the Ministers about in Triumph, tearing their Gowns, which they call'd The Rags of the Whore, and burning the Common Prayer, calling it the Mass in English. This was the Western Fanatick Rabble, who began their Work upon Christmas Day, to be witty in their Malice.

That at Edinburg the Tumult was so high, that the Mob forc'd the King's Palace, rifled the Chancellor's Lodgings, gutted the Chappel, carried the King's Picture to the Mercat-Cross, and there stab'd and tore it, with such sort of indignities, as some modest People

A 3 used

P R E F A C E.

used against the King's Statue at New-Castle and Gloucester. That upon these Disorders the College of Justice at Edinburgh took Arms, and kept Watch to secure the Peace of the City, and their Clergy from being Mobb'd. That when a Proclamation came from P. O. for all to lay down their Arms, the College of Justice obey'd it, but the Fanaticks did not, saying, they knew the Order was not intended against them, and they proceeded to greater Insults, particularly at Glasgow, which Town by 15. Act of 2. Sess. of 1. Parliament of W. and M. had great Favours granted them for the Zeal of the Community of the said City (who were the Principal Rabblers) for the Protestant Religion, as it is expressed in the Act.

The Rabbled Clergy applied to P. O. for Protection, and sent Dr. Scot Dean of Glasgow, and Dr. Fall Principal of the College to represent their Condition to his Highness who referr'd them to the Meeting of the Estates, which was not till March following. And when they desired Protection from the Rabble to the Meeting of the Estates, they receiv'd for Answer, That the Meeting of the Estates by their Act 13th April 1689 excluded from Protection all the Ministers who had been Rabbled before that Day, and were not in Possession of their Churches. And being turn'd into a Parliament, by their Act 7. June 1690. declared, These Rabbled Ministers had deserted their Churches, and therefore Judg'd them to be Vacant, and ordered those Presbyterians who had taken Possession of them, to continue in them, and have Right to Benefices and Stipends according to their Entry in the Year 1689. To which Act the Royal Assent was given.

The foresaid Act of Apr. 1689 obliged all that remained to Pray for K. W. and Q. M. as King and Queen of Scotland, and read a Proclamation publicly from their Pulpits against owning K. James. And this was to be read the next Day, viz. 14 Apr. 1689. by all the Ministers of Edinburgh, the 21st by all on that side the River Tay, and on the 28th by all be-north Tay which was hardly time to have the Proclamation transmitted.

P R E F A C E.

mitted to them all. At Edinburgh the Proclamation came not out till late on Saturday at Night, and it was to be read at Morning-Service next Day; so that many of them, it is suppos'd, had not an hour's time to resolve.

Matters being thus prepar'd for the Abolishing Episcopacy, an Act was fram'd, and Instructions sent to the Commissioner in these Words, You are to touch the Act already passed, Abolishing Episcopacy, as soon as you can, and to rescind all Acts inconsistent therewith. Accordingly the Act was Touch'd at Edinburgh, 22 July 1689.

That not only those Presbyterian Ministers, who were outed by the Bishops 1662, but even those who had been depos'd and put under Censures, as Incendiaries and wicked Men, by their own Presbyterian Synods 1660, and 1661. without being releas'd from those Censures were restor'd by Act of Parliament 1690.

That by their Act of 7 June 1690. the whole Church Government was placed in the Hands of those outed, Jan. 1661. (who were not above 50 or 60) and such as they should admit, exclusive of all other Presbyters; so that here was a Superiority allow'd, which was look'd on as an insupportable Grievance in Bishops. This Power these Upstarts exercise with a Tyranny never shewn in Bishops; for being enabled by the Act to Purge out all Insufficient, Negligent, Scandalous, and Erroneous Ministers, they set up Tribunals more Arbitrary than the Inquisition; in which they did one good Act, and that was purging out those Episcopal Presbyters that comply'd with the Schism.

In England the depriv'd Bishops and Clergy lost not their Character, but in Scotland by Act 35 of Sess. 2 of the first Parliament of W. and M. those Ministers who did not pray for K. W. and Q. M. and therefore were depriv'd, were afterwards prohibited to Exercise any part of the Ministerial Function in Churches or elsewhere.

P R E F A C E.

In the 38th Act of the same Session, they order a Certificate to be subscribed by all who take the Oath, declaring K. W. and Q. M. to be King and Queen, as well De Jure as De Facto. And say, That in all these things they have dealt more plainly, if not more honestly and sincerely, than we have done in England. But I know not how they will solve that Contradiction, which seems to be betwixt their Claim of Right 11 Apr. 1689. and their Confession of Faith ratified by Act 5. of Sess. 2. 1 Parl. W. and M. The first says, That by Law no Papist can be King or Queen of this Realm. And yet in the Confession ch. 23. It is decreed in these words, " Infidelity or Difference in Religion do not make void the Magistrates Just and " Legal Authority, nor free the People from their due " Obedience to him.

Were I to name all the Oppressions and arbitrary Proceedings in Scotland, I should swell this beyond the Bulk of Dr. King's Book; and the Truths of the Proceedings in Scotland, would out number the Falshoods he relates of Ireland. But I must not exceed the bounds of a Preface. For a fuller Account of the Scots Affairs, I refer the Reader to a Tract call'd, A Letter to a Friend, giving an Account of all the Treatises that have been Publish'd with Relation to the present Persecution, against the Church of Scotland. Printed for Jo. Hindmarsh. And another call'd, The late Proceedings and Votes of the Parliament of Scotland. And for the Affairs of the Church, An Account of the present Persecution of the Church of Scotland. The Case of the afflicted Clergy of Scotland. The Historical Relation of the General Assembly held at Edinburgh. And the Presbyterian Inquisition. There you will find such Cruelties us'd towards the Loyal and Episcopal Party in Scotland, as were unheard of in Ireland, and by Dr. King's Principles would justify any Foreign Prince to interpose in their behalf. And if it be true which he lays down, " That if a King design to destroy one main " part of his People in favour of another whom he loves " better, he does Abdicate the Government of those whom " he designs to destroy. I say, if this be true, the Loyal Scots

P R E F A C E.

Scots had Reason to think themselves free from all Obligation to K. W's Government.

And if this be true, as is asserted, I would ask him, whether he and such Loyal Subjects, according to his Principles, would think themselves free from all Obligation to K. W's Government.

Suppose (though it is false) as Dr. King asserts, That K. James while in Ireland endeavour'd to overthrow the Establish'd Church there, and set up what was most agreeable to the Inclinations of the major part of the People in that Kingdom, who are Roman Catholics; would not this be fully Vindicated in the fourth Instruction which K. W. sent to the Commissioners in Scotland, dated at Copt-hall 31 May, 1689. in these Words, " You are to pass an Act establishing that Church Government which is most agreeable to the Inclinations of the People. By which Rule the Scots say it was more just to set up Popery in Ireland, than Presbytery in Scotland, contrary to the Inclination of the major Part of their Nation. That the Parliament in Ireland was less liable to Exception, than that in Scotland. The one being call'd in the usual Form by Writs from their Natural King; the other by Circular Letters from a Forreign Prince, to whom they ow'd no Obedience.

That it was only Allieg'd, That K. J. intended to do what he did not do in Ireland, and what K. W. actually did in Scotland, viz. To overturn the Church then by Law Establish'd. That the Argument is carried on by Dr. King's Book, and many Pamphlets grafted upon it, that the Church of England ought to expect the same Treatment which they pretend the Church of Ireland met with from K. J. and his Popish Parliament. But yet have no Apprehensions from what was done to the Church of Scotland, which a Presbyterian Convention pluck'd up by the Roots, living peaceably and offending no Man; whilst K. J. left the Church of Ireland Establish'd by Law, where all her Members, to a very small Number were in Arms against him.

Many

P R E F A C E.

Many other things the Non-jurors do plead, with which I will not detain the Reader; they have made large Apologies for themselves, and Dr. King's Book will afford them Matter for more.

The Reader is desir'd to observe, That this Answer being prepar'd upon the first coming out of Dr. King's Book, the Quotations of the Page are according to the first Edition of it in Quarto.

A Hint to the Reader.

THE Abstract of Dr. King's Book being introduc'd with the plausible Story of sound and useful Reasoning, and if clear and abundant Information of all the Transactions it relates; the Abridger, to give the better Face to the Matter, varnishes it over with the Licence of the E. of Nottingham, who was then Secretary of State; and, to procure the greater Credit to it, as he thinks, prefixes a Narrative taken from a certain B...p's Preface to a Volume of Sermons in Octavo. These are our Abridger's Credentials and Vouchers: Whose steady Loyalty, and Orthodox Principles to Church and Monarchy, who dare question, or would be ashamed to own?

But to tell the Reader the Truth, the Design of the Whigs publishing Dr. King's Book at this time is only to give a Colour to the Old Republican Principles, which they have taken from *Oliver* and the *Rump* Administration, and which the Dr. borrows and makes use of, to justify some illegal Practices against a Lawful Power. And indeed he handles this desperate Weapon like a Madman; for he strikes at the Root of Monarchy at once; nor is he less sparing of the Church; for he will have all Ecclesiastical Power in the Crown to be derived from the People. For this the Whigs hug the Dr. and cannot be persuaded, that any one will dispute the Principles of an AB. tho' they take their Original from *Bradshaw*, *Rutherford*, *Bellarmin* and *Mariana*. And therefore this ABSTRACT of Dr. King's Book is industriously dispers'd to invite People their Opinion. It is strange to think that a Man of to such Orthodox Principles, should dwindle into the very Dreggs of Rebellious Notions! That such an one should be for deposing and banishing Kings! And set up Liberty and Property in opposition to Right! Nay, I cannot say any thing relating to the Character

A Hint to the Reader.

of an Antimonarchical Whig, but what this Book of Dr. King's maintains.

And for this it is, our Modern Whigs give such mighty Encomiums of it; for they love the Author of it as an AB. no more than he lov'd his Master, whom he betray'd. But he being metamorphos'd for the worse, and taking shelter under their Principles, they question not in the least, but all he says will go down smoothly now. But, thanks to God, we are not yet so stupid: For any one may plainly see. That it is not the Protestant Succession in the House of *Hanover* that they have so much at Heart, as their own Interest, *i. e.* That they might *Alamode Forty One*, carve out the Monarchy again according to their own vicious Fancies, and be Kings themselves.

And now our Abridger may expect I should say something of his other Voucher; but besides that I think him below the Dignity of an Animadversion, there are some Advantages he can make use of against the plainest Truth, and to which, I shall not expose myself. *S---n*, *M---m* for that. However I'll venture to tell our Abridger this, that the meaness of his Attestation will very much diminish the Credit of his Cause; which being supported by Untruths, can last no longer than a Body worn out with Diseases, that is indulg'd with Cordials, which instead of reviving, do but devour natural Heat. This, Poor Whig, is thy Case, and that will be the Fate of Thee and thy rotten Republican Principles.

I shall say no more of the Book or the Authors, but leave them to the management of that celebrated Hand, who has sufficiently confuted and expos'd them in the following Sheets some Years since.

CONTENTS.

CONTENTS.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| T HE Division of the Answer into <i>Principles</i> and <i>Matters of Fact</i> of the Author. | Page 1 |
| First for his Principles. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| They are hard to be Collected, being not me- thodically set down. | 2. |
| His Principles the old Exploded Commonwealth Principles which he endeavours to conceal. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| He drives the Ecclesiastical Authority from the People. | 3. |
| His Interpretation of that Law which declares it not to be Lawful upon any Pretence to Arm against the King, &c. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Several Schemes of Government set up. | 4. |
| The Case of one Prince interposing between another Prince and his Subjects. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| This Author's Defence of his Principles from Reason. | 5. |
| 1. Reason of a King designing to destroy his <i>Whole</i> People. | 6. |
| 2. Part of his People. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| 3. To disarm them. | 7. |
| The Author's Rule for <i>Abdication</i> consider'd. | <i>ib.</i> |
| 4. Of dissolving the Oaths of <i>Allegiance</i> . | 8. |
| 5. The Question who shall be Judge? | 9. |
| Apply'd to Parliaments and States. | 10. |
| Compared with Kings. | 11. |
| Of Jealousies and Fears. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Instances in the <i>French League</i> . | 12. |
| Of the Prince of <i>Wales</i> . | <i>ibid.</i> |
| | Earl |

C O N T E N T S.

| | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------|
| Earl of <i>Essex</i> . | | 13. |
| Of Evil not | } Tolerable. | 15 |
| | } Universal. | |
| A Passage our Author quotes out of <i>Falkner</i> , and misapplies. | | 17. |
| The Evils of | { Tyranny. } compar'd. | <i>ib.</i> |
| | { Civil Wars. } | |
| The Author's Remedy for <i>Tyranny</i> , to kill <i>Half</i> <i>the Nation</i> . | | 18. |
| This Author's Defence of his Principles from <i>Authority</i> | | 28. |
| From Scripture. | | <i>ibid</i> |
| Disprov'd from Scripture. | | 29. |
| 1. The <i>Jews</i> in <i>Egypt</i> . | | <i>ibid.</i> |
| 2. In <i>Babylon</i> . | | <i>ibid.</i> |
| 3. Under the <i>Romans</i> . | | 30 |
| 4. Under <i>Ahasuerus</i> . | | <i>ibid.</i> |
| 5. The <i>Gibeonites</i> . | | <i>ibid.</i> |
| 6. Our Saviour <i>Christ</i> . | | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Primitive Christians, | | |
| | { <i>Jovian</i> . | 31 |
| | { <i>Homilies</i> . | |
| From | { <i>Grotius</i> . | 32. |
| | { <i>Hammond</i> . | 33. |
| | { <i>Hicks</i> . | 24. |
| | { <i>Falkner</i> . | 35. |
| The Protestants under <i>Q. Mary</i> . | | 36. |
| Matters of Fact of our Author. The principal Matter of Fact, <i>viz.</i> Who were the Ag- gressors. in the Revolution in <i>Ireland</i> . | | 37. |
| Lord <i>Tyrconnel</i> 's haste to run the Nation into Blood. | | 41. |
| The Protestants in <i>Ireland</i> worse treated by K. <i>W</i> 's Army than by K. <i>J</i> 's. | | 49. |
| Character of K. <i>J</i> . from | { this Author | |
| | { and | |
| | { Lord <i>Danby</i> . | 50. |
| | | K. |

C O N T E N T S.

| | |
|---|--------------|
| K. J. oppos'd the Act of <i>Attainder</i> and <i>Repeal</i> of the <i>Acts of Settlement</i> . | 51. |
| This Author guilty of Treason against K. J. whilst under his Protection. | 53. |
| The gross Hypocrisy of the <i>Irish Protestant</i> Clergy in praying for K. J. and the Prince of <i>Wales</i> . | 55. |
| This Author formerly a Zealous Man for Passive Obedience even in the beginning of the Re- volution. | 56. |
| Dr. <i>Tillotson's</i> extent of Loyalty in his Sermon before K. Ch. II. And before the H. of Com- mons. | 59. |
| The behaviour of the Clergy in taking the Oaths. | 61. |
| Of the depriv'd Clergy. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Roman Catholicks</i> Loyalty; particularly of the <i>Irish</i> . | 62 |
| Of the <i>English Roman Catholicks</i> . | 63 |
| <i>Non-jurors</i> of the Church of <i>England</i> . | <i>ib.</i> |
| <i>Presbyterian</i> Loyalty. | 65 |
| Popish Principles which are embrac'd, viz. de- posing Doctrine, dispensing with Oaths, &c. | <i>ib.</i> |
| Church of <i>England</i> Vindicated. | 66 |
| Matters of Fact set down by this Author at Ran- dom. | <i>ib.</i> |
| His <i>Inuendo's</i> . | 67 |
| The Story of Mr. <i>Bell</i> . | 69 |
| Contradictory Matters of Fact. | 70 |
| Especially with relation to K. <i>James</i> , whom he does not treat with common Decency, giving him the Lye, &c. | 71 |
| The Case of Mr. <i>Brown</i> and Sir <i>Thomas South-</i> <i>well</i> . | 72, 73 |
| Of K. <i>James's</i> keeping his Protections. | 77 |

C O N T E N T S.

| | |
|---|------------|
| The Massacre of <i>Glencoe</i> , with others of his <i>Clan</i> . | <i>ib.</i> |
| An abominable Mis-representation of this Author in relation to the Protestants in the County of <i>Down</i> . | <i>ib.</i> |
| The Breach of Articles charg'd upon K. J. upon the Surrender of the Fort of <i>Culmore</i> refused. | 82 |
| Retorted in the notorious Breach of the Articles upon the Surrender of <i>Carrick-fergus</i> and of <i>Drogheda</i> . | <i>ib.</i> |
| Of <i>Cork</i> and <i>Limerick</i> , and the cruel Usage of the Prisoners. | 82, 83 |
| Of K. J's letting the English Fleet decay, with the Author's Recantation. | 84 |
| The Insincerity of this Author in Quoting K. J's Answer to the Petition of some Lords for a Parliament 17 Nov. 1688. | 88 |
| And in some Quotations of <i>Grotius</i> . | <i>ib.</i> |
| He confesses the Irish Papists were not the Aggressors in the Revolution, and gives Reasons why they were not so. | 90 |
| This Author wounds the Government in the Person of K. J. and the Papists. | 91 |
| He renders the King's Prerogative hateful to the People, and inclines them to a Commonwealth. | 92 |
| The Author's Conclusion and Protestation of his Sincerity. | 96 |
| His representing K. <i>James</i> to be worse than the <i>French</i> King. Or the Great <i>Turk</i> and <i>Pharaoh</i> . | <i>ib.</i> |

T H E



THE Author of the Book we are about to answer, after the plausible old way of *Forty One*, first casts the blackest Aspersions upon the late K. *James*, to gain the more Credit to his Vindication of the Irish Protestants from Rebellion in the late Revolution, and then lays down Principles of such dangerous Consequence as afford Pretence for War and Confusion to the end of the World.

This Charge, being easy to be made Good, will prove, I hope, a Service to this Nation, so naturally in late Ages inclin'd to Rebellion and Revolution; and which have hitherto been occasioned chiefly by such Principles as are set out in this Book.

It is the Duty of all Men to correct Mistakes; but we ought to be very careful not to transmit Untruths or false Representations to Posterity, especially of our Superiors, as our own natural Kings, whose Fame, as well as Persons we are in Conscience bound to Defend, so far as is consistent with Truth, otherwise we are Abettors with those, *that slander the Footsteps of the Lord's anointed.*

This Book of our Author I shall consider in two Respects, in his Principles and Matters of Fact.

1. As to his Principles, he no where sets them down in plain Terms, but leaves us to collect them from Hints immethodically scatter'd. And these are all the Old Rotten, Rebel, Common-wealth Principles exploded in Fanatical Authors, condemned in the *Oxford* Decree; and the universal Consent of the Divines of the Church of *England*, but by

none more than this Author. Therefore 'tis no wonder that in a covert Manner, he let these Principles drop from him, which he so lately embrac'd, and shamefully quitted. But something he must say, and to clear his Passage, that grand stumbling Block, the Doctrine of Passive Obedience must be removed. To perform this his Introduction p. 1. contains an *Explication of the Doctrine of Passive Obedience, and stating the true Notion and Latitude of it.* Yet he only gives other People's Thoughts of it: He begins *It's granted by some*—but gives no positive Opinion of his own, otherwise than more favourably representing one side than another. In the Heads of his Discourse he promises more fairly than he performs in the Book. Num. 1. of the Introduction is, *That a King, who designs to destroy a People, abdicates the Government of them.* Which Position unexplain'd would be of most destructive Consequence. But our Author leaves it in Generals, make of it what you can.

By what I can collect out of him, his Principle is the same with *Bradshaw* in his Speech upon the Trial of *K. Charles I. viz. That all Power is from the People: That Kings are their Deputies, and accountable to them.* And yet *Dr. Sherlock*, even after his Conversion, most bitterly inveighs against this in his Sermon before the *House of Commons* 30 of Jan. 1691. p. 18. Now, that this Author asserts these Principles will plainly appear.

Ch. 3. f. 1. n. 8. he says, *That it is ill trusting any one (any King,) with such a Power.*

Again, c. 1. n. 10. p. 11. he says, *The antient Government with which he (the King) was entrusted,* p. 41. he falls upon those that stop'd the Bill of Exclusion, with this Caution, *never to trust Men of K. James's Principles and Religion with a Power that may destroy us.* Here the Kings Power is only what the People trust him with. Page 57. *It is not the King's Money that pays the Soldiers, but the Kingdoms;* and thence it follows,

follows, that the Soldiers are not the King's, but the Kingdoms. From p. 67 to 77. he drives on at a most Antimonarchical rate, depriving all but the Electors of Parliament-Men of any Security of their Lives or Properties; for which he smooths them over again, by giving them a Power to dispense with their Allegiance to the King, whenever they shall think he dispenses with the Laws; not considering the King as the Fountain of Law, and from whom all Commissions, particularly this of Electing, are derived.

And now our Author is upon his Carreer, he tramples down every thing in his way; p. 206. even *the Ecclesiastical Authority which is entrusted in the Crown*, shall be derived from the People, and transferable by them to whom they please; by which he gratifies the Phanaticks as well as Republicans to the highest Degree. But to Crown all p. 221: he out does *Bradshaw, Rutherford, Bellarmin or Mariana*, in a very loose Interpretation of that famous Principle of the Church of England, viz. *That it is not lawful upon any pretence whatever to take up Arms against the King*; for he says, it was only meant, *That private Men should not take up the Sword, or resist the King*, that is, says he, *upon any pretence of private Injury*: Tho' at the same time he could not but know how plainly the Parliament speak their Sense of the forefaid Maxim of the Church of England in 12. Car. 2. c. 30. *That neither Peers nor Commons, nor both together have any Coercive Power over the Kings of England*. Which is not only an Act of that Parliament, but a *Recognition* of the Laws before them. And to take off all co-ordinate Power with the King, the Militia (which is the Sword of England) is by 13. Car. 2. put into the hands of the King alone. *The Sword is solely in the King's Power, and neither one or both Houses of Parliament can levy or raise War against his Majesty*. This was the Sense

of that Parliament without doubt, which was grounded upon the fatal Consequences of the Peoples asserting their Rights and Properties in Opposition to the King, and which had but a little while before made this Nation a Field of Blood.

At the time our Author gave himself this Loose of Principles, several Schemes of Government were erected. Some founded Government upon the *Municipal Laws* of the Land, upon the Breach of which, the King forfeits his Crown. Others founded Government on the *Laws*, which are the result of it. But this Dr. Tillotson will not allow, in a Country, where the Law it self makes it unlawful to resist the King. Others fly to the dark Notion of *Original Contract*, which they will have Prior to all Laws. But some, thinking this Plea too precarious, chuse another sort of a way, call'd *Abdication*, but more perplex'd than any of the rest, even in the present Case. Lastly, there is a wiser Set, who love to be on the *Stronger Side*; and these cry up *Success* as a *Divine Right*.

Now our Author comes last, and like a drowning Man, he catches at some or all of these, but holds by none. However we must follow him as he pleases to lead us, tho' it is not easy to find him out.

His Principles of *Government* which he hides in Generals, are plainly Antimonarchical, and what Proof he offers for them is in his Introduction, where he pretends to prove, *That a King who designs to destroy a People, Abdicates the Government of them*. Thence c. 2. and 3. he endeavours to shew, *That K. James had that Design*. Ergo—

But c. 1. he goes a little aside, and undertakes this Subject, viz. *That it is lawful for one Prince to interpose between another Prince and his Subjects, when he uses them cruelly*. From whence he argues, that it is lawful not only for every Prince, but for every Neighbour to inspect his Neighbours Family, and to dispossess

dispossess him when he uses them cruelly: And this pious Interposer shall seize all for himself, on pretence of using them better.

He gives Instances of several interposing Princes, and so he may of many more, and none of them to be justify'd. Suppose good Kings have done this? May not good Kings have their Failings? I do not think that *David's* Decision betwixt *Ziba* and *Mephibosheth* would be a good Rule for future Justice. Tho' our Author has not truly represented all the Instances he produces, which shall be shewn. But if they were true, they would be no Arguments.

I shall only put him in Mind of his own Words, which I shall have Occasion to mention hereafter, viz. *That it is a most unlawful thing for any to call in a forreign Force, or erect a new Government to Redress unjust Laws—* And again, *That it is intolerable for the Members of any State to flee to Foreign Succours, under Pretence, that their own Governours have made Laws against Reason, Conscience and Justice; and foolish to alledge in their Defence, That all Mankind is of one Blood, and bound to help one another.*

I leave our Author to Recant this, or Reconcile it at his Leisure to the first Chapter of his Book. Let us now examine his Defence of these Principles. And first we will consider his *Arguments*; secondly, his *Quotations* and *Authorities*.

The Point he is to prove, we will take in his own Words, n. 1. of the Introduction, viz. *That a King who designs to destroy his People, Abdicates the Government of them.* And here as to his Reasons or Arguments he disappoints us; for his whole Introduction is nothing but Quotations; however we will examine what we can find.

Thus then he sets forth. “ It is granted by some
“ of the highest Asserters of Passive Obedience;
“ that if a King design to root out a People, or de-
“ stroy one main part of his Subjects, in favour of
“ another

“ another whom he loves better, that they may
 “ prevent it even by opposing him with Force;
 “ and that he is to be Judg’d in such a Case to have
 “ *Abdicated* the Government of those whom he de-
 “ signs to destroy, contrary to Justice and the Laws.

In this Assertion, and which he does not prove, we will consider these three things. First, a King designing to destroy the *whole People*. Secondly, his design to destroy a *part only* of his People. And, Thirdly, the Point of *Abdication* in such a Case.

1. *Grotius*, as quoted by our Author, says it cannot enter into the Heart of a King, who is not Mad; for that would be to destroy himself. And History affords no Instance of this kind. If our Author will insist upon this, every sober Man will think him as mad, as *Grotius* thought that King, who should attempt any such thing: For what Hands should a King employ to destroy all his Subjects? But enough of this, lest I too be thought Mad to labour in such a Case.

2. The King’s Design to destroy a *Part only* of his People. What part? Every Man is a *part* of the People: And if all People, who think themselves oppress’d under any Government may take Arms against it, there would be little Peace in the World. Again, if a Government’s Design to destroy a Man dissolves its Authority, condemn’d Criminals are no longer Subjects. This is an unavoidable Consequence of our Author’s Principle.

C. 3. f. 8. n. 2. p. 97. he lays it down as a Principle, That Government likewise *dissolves it self* in ruining the *Property* of the Subject. Here we may ask, how much Ruin of Property is sufficient to dissolve a Government? And he seems to answer it, by putting in the Word *Entirely*. But this cannot be, while one Man has a Groat in the Kingdom. So that our Author’s putting in the Word *Intirely*, was only to amuse.

But

But in the same Section, n. 8. p. 74. he plainly tells his meaning, That the Government's taking away the Charter of *Derry* unjustly, as he says, was sufficient Ground for them to take Arms against it, which he calls, *doing themselves Justice*. And further he says, *If there had been no other Temptation but this, they were not to be blamed, to withdraw themselves from a Government they durst not trust*. And then to improve every thing to the utmost, he says, *That a Government that could take away their Charter, might take away what remain'd, with their Lives*.

But a Government offering to *disarm* those they know to be their mortal Enemies, is enough to dissolve it; as in the Case of my Lord Deputy of *Ireland* disarming the Protestants there; who, as our Author owns p. 3. after all their disarming, *had Arms enough to make the Papists afraid, and to beat them too*. And yet the Government disarming those they could come at, this Author proves to be a Design even of a Massacre, p. 115. tho' the Generality of the Protestants were out of the reach of the Government. And p. 112. he calls the disarming only of a few, *perfect Dragooning, terrible Dragooning*.

I come now to the third Point, that is, of Abdicatation; the only true Notion of which by all Civilians, is, *A Kings voluntary Resignation of the Crown to the next Heir*. But take it in what Sense our Author will, it is of no Service to his justifying his *Irish Protestants*, who were in Arms against K. James before the Convention in England had declar'd him to have *Abdicated*. But this Author must not stay for that; tho' it was strongly debated in the Convention, whether K. James's *Withdrawing*, was an *Abdicatation* or not? Which shews, that they thought the Decision of some regular Assembly necessary to settle that Point, and not to be left to every Man to decide.

C. i. n. 8. p. 10. he says, *By endeavouring to destroy us, he (the King) in that very Act abdicated the Government— and therefore in all Equity we are absolved from Oaths to him as Governour.* That is to say, If a King bring a *Quo Warranto* against a *Charter*, take the Benefit of the Law against any of his Subjects, in a legal Manner, his Government's dissolv'd, and his People absolv'd from their Oaths. Learnedly argued indeed, as to the Nature of Oaths. But he goes on in the same Section, n. 10. p. 11. *That K. James consenting to repeal the Oath of Supremacy in Ireland, prov'd that he either design'd to release us from the peculiar Obligation arising from them (our Oaths of Allegiance) as too strict, or else that he did not depend on our Oaths for our Loyalty (whoever does will be mistaken) and therefore laid them aside, as of no force to oblige us; either of which proceed from an Intention to destroy the Antient Government with which he was entrusted.* Suppose this, would it absolve the Oaths taken before? Or because K. James would repeal the Oath of Supremacy, must our Author infer, That he meant to release the Protestants from their Allegiance to himself in Temporals? Or can he think K. James repealed this Oath, because it was too Loyal? I am ashamed to ask the Question, none are ignorant of the Reason of it.

This Argument of our Author's is *verbatim* almost in the Writings of the *Cameronian Presbyterians*, who pretend to prove, That K. Charles II. consenting to Repeal the *Covenant*, did thereby remit the *Subjects Allegiance*, by annulling the *Bond* of it. vid. *Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, Printed at London, 1692. P. 49.

Our Author has one Argument more, why Allegiance to K. James did cease; *He (K. James) having left none (no Oath of Allegiance) that we know of in this Kingdom, which any Law obliges us to take.* And what then? Is there no Allegiance due where there

is no Oath? Our Allegiance is by the Law of *England* Prior to the King's Oath to us, or our's to him: Oaths in that Case do not create the Duty, but confirm it.

But the main Difficulty is yet behind: Who shall be Judge of these Forfeitures or Abdications? Our Author resolves it thus: *That either the People must be left to Judge of the Designs of their Governours—Or else they must be oblig'd to a blind and absolute Submission, without employing their Understanding in the Case.* This is very poor. For in this Case, the meaning is not who shall have Power to think in his own Mind: But when there is a Contest between King and People, there can be no other Judge than God alone. This is too sly an Insinuation, and will not stand Proof.

The Question then is concerning an *Authoritative* Judge; and our Author appeals to the *World*, whether it be not safer to leave it to the Judgment and Consciences of a whole Kingdom to determine concerning the *Designs of their Governour, than to the Will and Conscience of the King, whether he will destroy them.* This is plausible, and no doubt would gain the Cry at an Election. Thus cunning Incendiaries, such as *Abolom, Sheba, Oliver*, and other prosperous Rebels, by Mis-representing their Governours, impos'd on the People. And yet by this, or any other way of the People, they were never to be brought all to a fair Vote; a thing utterly impossible.

But let us bring our Author to Matter of Fact. Are not all Revolutions carried on by making Parties, and other factious Methods to win the Mob? Did they ever speak nothing but the *honest Truth* of the Governour against whom they took Arms? Did they ever leave it freely to the Judgment of the People without partial Mis-representations or invidious Insinuations? Certainly it is more easy to suppose a giddy People to be Debauch'd by crafty,

ty, insinuating Men, who mis-represent their Governour, fill the Peoples Heads with Fears and Jealousies, and over-rate every Hardship, than that a King should design to destroy his People, which is to destroy himself. The first of these has often been our Case, the other is imaginary, and without an Instance.

Nor will the Number of the People or Greatness of their Leaders justify their Rebellion. In that of *Korah* there were 250 Princes with the whole Congregation that mutinied against *Moses* and *Aaron*; for which God destroy'd, besides those that were swallow'd up with *Korah*, 14700. Numb. 16. If such a Governour as *Moses* could not secure himself from the Power of factious Leaders, who can pretend to it? We know how *Absalom* stole the Hearts of the People from his Father *David*: They follow'd him in the *Simplicity of their Hearts*, as many did at first in the Rebellion against *Charles* the Martyr. But these are dangerous Steps, few retreat, when gotten so far, and if there be a visible motive of Interest, it makes their Return still more difficult.

But to conclude this Point in our Author's Phrase; *I dare appeal to the World*, whether it be more dangerous to exempt the King from the Judgment of the People, or to put it in the Power of discontented, ambitious Men to endeavour to disgust the People against the Government? For that is the true State of the Question.

We know by what means *False Religions*, and *Seditious Principles* have spread thro' the World; and no doubt this Author calculated his Book for the People, upon whom he knew he might impose, with fine Stories of their *Power*, paramount to all Kings and Governours.

And here the Question, *Who shall be Judge?* may be apply'd to *Parliaments* or *States*. Would any
Member

Member of the Parliament, or States loose so much by the Destruction of the People as the King? Therefore it's less probable he should *design* it's Destruction, than *any of them*. There may be an *Equivalent* given to any of them to betray and ruin their Country. *Jugurtha* brib'd the Senate of Rome, whilst at War with them. It's within Memory, that the *French Faction* among the Burghers of *Amsterdam* were able to *out-vote* the others. The alarm of *French Pensioners* have disturb'd our Parliaments. But was there ever a *Parliament, Convention, or Senate*, where the major Number was unbribeable? Or was there ever a King brib'd to betray or sell his Country? He may be deceiv'd or take wrong Measures, but it is inconceivable he should design the Ruin of his Country. Therefore whoever is Judge of the King's Designs, must be a Judge of the Designs of *Parliaments and States*; which will unhinge all Government.

But our Author, to smoothe all this says, in the beginning of this Section, n. 1. p. 12. *Fears and Jealousies in such a Case ought not to pass for Arguments, or be brought in Competition with OBEDIENCE to LAWFUL GOVERNOURS. But the Arguments brought by Subjects to prove their Governours designs to destroy them, ought to be so plain, that the Consciences of Mankind cannot but see them, and be convinc'd of their Truth; especially the generality of the Subjects.* But this leaves us where we were; for every Man is Judge still; and Men that are deceiv'd think themselves in the Right. So that the Rule of Government is still left precarious and loose, uncertain as the giddy Motions of the Mob, and laid open to the attempts of Ambitious and Designing Men.

Our Author's Sense of *Jealousies and Fears* needs some Explanation; for till the Action be done, we can have no other Notion of a Governour's Design,
than

than, *Jealousy* and *Fear*. Actions of Governours and Matters of State, are done out of several Designs, and there is nothing more natural than for others to mistake them, especially if they be kept as Secrets of State !

But then see into what mistakes these *Jealousies* and *Fears* are apt to lead People, when they are thus prejudic'd. The suppos'd League between K. *James* and K. *Lewis* xiv. to root out the Protestants all the World over was industriously spread, and it was confidently affirm'd, that the P. of *Orange* had procur'd the Original sign'd by both Kings, and would produce it in Parliament. But neither that *Prince* in his *Declaration*, nor the *Convention* in their List of Male-administrations against K. *James* made the least mention of it. This was clamour'd about, and believ'd ; and yet the Earl of *Sunderland* in his Letter, quoted by this Author p. 145. protests *he never knew of any ; and that French Ships were offer'd to join our Fleet but were refus'd*. Nor was it heard of after by any of common Sense, till this Author publish'd it in his Thanksgiving Sermon before the Lords Justices of *Ireland*, Nov 16. 1690. *A League*, says he, *notorious and remarkable for it's Folly and Falshood, so contrary to all Sense as well as Faith, that the Great Princes concern'd in it, are yet asham'd to own it*. But he knows better, and now his hand is in, he'll tell you the whole Design: viz. (Serm. p. 5. 9. 16.)

“ The Empire to be divided between the *Turk* and
 “ the *German* Princes, the *Dauphin* to be made
 “ King of the *Romans*, *Savoy* to be brought under
 “ Pupillage, the Princes of *Italy* to be frightened,
 “ bought or wheedled ; *Genoa* to be bombarded,
 “ *England* bought, *Holland* drown'd ; (alas ! poor
 “ *Holland*) the Q. of *Spain* designedly made barren,
 “ and the P. of *Wales* a Cheat. Here's a Plot for
 you ! Then the Trash, with which he bespatters K. *James*, is such as would make a *Grubstreet* Author blush.

blush. Yet this he has set his Name to, and Dedicated to the Lords Justices of *Ireland*:

As to the business of the P. of *Wales*, he gives no other Proof but p. 5. of his Sermon, where he says, *We are satisfied*, i. e. of his being a Cheat. In so important a Point, he ought to have been particular. But by this time, I suppose, like the rest of those times, he is of another Opinion; and especially, since the Record of that Prince's Birth stands unrevers'd to this Day.

There is nothing so ridiculous, but it will pass as Plain and Evident with some People in some Junctures. It was currently believ'd, that the 3500 disbanded *Irish* were to Massacre all *England*, and the Assassinating of the Earl of *Essex* went down greedily for a while with some; tho' People of Sense did not believe it, particularly his Lady; and a Committee of Lords appointed since the Revolution to Rake into that Matter, were forc'd to drop it. But *Braddon's* Trial, and Mr. *Ferguson's* Account of that pretended Murder, charging it upon the King and his Brother (which he now in all Companies freely recants, and owns how he was impos'd upon in *Holland*, by Accounts from hence; he being still alive) are enough to detect it to any unprejudic'd Reader.

But that our Author may not always be accus'd of proving nothing that he says, he undertakes to make out the *Grand League* before told, in his Sermon aforesaid, from Bishop *Malcony's* Letter to Bishop *Tyrrel*; wherein that Bishop blames K. *James* for rejecting the generous Assistance the K. of *France* offered him. And this is that *ALLIANCE* with *FRANCE* (says our Author p. 5. of his aforesaid Sermon) which some Trimmers (as Bishop *Malcony* calls them) oblig'd K. *JAMES* to disown. And why should not K. *James* disown it, since there was no such thing? 'Tis well known that Succour was offer'd

offer'd him from *France* against the Prince of *Orange*; and that he rejected it. How then can the *French League* be prov'd from this Letter of Bishop *Maloony* which speaks the direct contrary? Yet this is all our Author's Proof, which he cannot forbear extolling. This, says he, is the very Source and Fountain of all the Calamities of Europe, but more particularly of ours. Here our Author shews himself a Person of no common Front, otherwise he would blush to bring the strongest Objection against him, as an Argument for him. But this is no new Matter. It is the constant Method in all Commotions of State. *Fortiter Calumniare*, says *Matchiavel*, Throw much Dirt, some will stick. Thus were many in *England* made believe that K. *Charles I.* and Bishop *Laud* were Papists? How many believe it still? Witness that infamous Letter of *Major General Ludlow* to *Sr. E. S.* comparing the Tyranny of the first four Years Reign of K. *Charles I.* with the Tyranny of the four Years Reign of the *Abdicated King James*; and the two or three Vindications of the same Letter printed since. There are many in *England* of this Opinion still, and think all Men mad, who offer to deny it, or, in our Author's Words, think that the Consciences of Mankind cannot but see it, and be convinc'd of the Truth of it. And yet there are many who will not confess it, but think K. *Charles* to have been a good Man and a *Martyr*; and that he stood up more for the Laws and Liberty of the Subject, than his Murtherers who offended against the Law much more by Rebelling against him, than he did, if all they charg'd him with had been true. Our Author was once of this Opinion, and I hope by this time is return'd to it.

Never any Charge against a Government was aver'd to be more apparent and undeniable than that of *Dathan* and *Abiram* against *Moses*. Num. 16. 13. 14. where he was accus'd of *Arbitrary Government*,
and

and Breach of Promise. And besides this positive Assurance which they had, they likewise (as our Author) had the gift of improving a Breach of Promise, or an arbitrary Design into a Design against their Lives: Because he disappointed them, as *they were very sure*, of their Inheritance in their Fields and Vineyards, and had a Mind to make himself more arbitrary, *altogether a Prince over them*, therefore they charg'd him with a Design to *kill them in the Wilderness*. Now if a People could be so impos'd upon by cunning designing Men, as to believe the most notorious Untruths against the *best Governour that ever was in the World*, what Government can subsist upon our Author's Principles, which allow every Man a Latitude to try his Arts upon the soft part of the People? And if he can work them into an ill Opinion of their Governours, and cry it is *certain and notorious*, absolves them *ipso facto* from all Obedience and Oaths, and puts it in the Power of every *Boutefeu*, to set the Nation in a Flame at his Pleasure.

N. 3. of his Introduction was designed to obviate this, it's Title is in these Words, *The Arguments of Passive Obedience from Reason and Scripture, reach only Cases where the Mischief is Particular or Tolerable*. If he means by *Tolerable* as much as a Man can bear, no Passive Obedience-Man can stretch it higher; since no Man can bear more than he can: But if he means what a Man can bear *Easily*, without doubt he will not let it grow to heavy for him. No Rebel can desire a greater Latitude: For whenever he has a Mind to bear no more, then no more *Passive Obedience*. Thus much for the Word *Tolerable*.

The other Qualification, *viz. Particular*, is, as he explains it, p. 3 *when the Mischief is not Universal*. *Universal* as to it's *Tendency*, is where a Mischief done to one Person may be a Precedent to have the like done to another, and so till it comes to be *Universal*. And in this Sense our Author will not allow any
Mischief

Mischief from a Government to be *Particular*. If the King take one Man's Life or Property, it must not be allow'd to be a *particular* Case, but the Case of the whole Kingdom. Thus *Hambden* contested his Assessment (which was about twenty Shillings) and embroil'd the Reign of K. *Charles I.* *Magdalen College* was not thought a *particular* Case, and did no small Service against K. *James II.* In short all Mischief is done to some *Particulars*, and *Universal* is but many *Particulars*: Therefore what is done to one, may be inferred to the rest; and in this Sense no Mischief can be *Particular*. Will this Author say, that the Business of *Glenco* was only a *particular* Mischief? But whenever a Mischief either in it's *Tendency*, or *Actually* affects the *Universal*, that is the People; yet in this Sense, it is not *Universal*, if any part of the People be excepted. But suppose a King to design the Destruction of a *part* of his People: The Question will be, Whether it be greater Destruction to the People to run the hazard of this under the Protection of God, while in Obedience to his Command, rather than to raise a Civil War to remedy this? And our Author seems to answer this N. 4. of his Introduction, which bears this Title, *A War not always a greater Evil than Suffering*. He calls it a *War*; which is a general Word, and relates to Differences between independent Princes: But when Subjects levy War against their Governour, 'tis call'd Rebellion. And this is the present Question, whether *This*, or *Suffering* be the greatest Evil? And our Author says, *'Tis not always a greater Evil than Suffering*. This was Cautious indeed. It is not *always* so. But what if it be so for the *most part*? Is it therefore to be chosen? This is all Sham; for the Law allows of *no such Case*, nor *any Pretence whatever*, to take Arms against the King.

One would think it hard for our Author to get over this. Yet he attempts it, c. 1. n. 8. p. 10! where he says, *That this may not seem a new Doctrine, I would have the Reader to observe, I only transcribe the Learned Falkner, &c.* But with our Author's leave; he has pick'd up this Sentence out of *Falkner*, and tho' all the Words he quotes are in *Falkner's Christian Loyalty*, l. 2. c. 5. Sect. 2. n. 19. Yet I must charge him with a False Quotation, for he leaves out such Words, as plainly shew, that *Falkner* does not set this down as his own Opinion, but only to follow upon a Supposition of *Grotius*, but is far from saying he approves of it. Which is plain from the next Words, where, as if it were confusing *Grotius's* Opinion, he quotes a contrary Authority out of *Bp. Bilson*. " If the Laws of the Land
 " do not permit them to guard their Lives, when
 " they are assaulted with unjust Force against Law;
 " or if they take Arms as you do, to depose Prin-
 " ces, we will never excuse them from Rebellion.

This is very unfair in our Author, and by misquoting so excellent and true a Son of the Church as *Dr. Falkner*, is offering a very great Indecency to the Dead, of whom we ought to speak no Ill, especially, if they were good.

But let us examine the Reasons he offers, why submitting to the *Tyranny* of our Lawful Governors; is a greater Evil than raising a *Civil War* in the Nation to prevent it; for that is the Case; and is the Explanation of what he meant above by *Tolerable* and *Universal* Evils. N. 3. p. 3. viz. " That we
 " ought to bear only with *Tolerable* Evils from our
 " Governors, or when the Mischief is not *Univer-*
 " *sal*; or if it be *Universal*, where it is yet *Tolera-*
 " *ble*, and not so Mischievous in the Consequence as
 " a *Civil War*.

Our Author surely forgot himself in advancing this Comparison of the Evils of *Tyranny* and *Rebellion*,

or a *Civil War*, as he more gracefully words it. So vast is the Disproportion betwixt the Evils of *Tyranny* and *Rebellion*! So much is the *Remedy* worse than the *Disease*! The Cruelty of a *Tyrant* is like a Clap of *Thunder*, and strikes with Terror; but a *Civil War* is like an *Inundation*, which sweeps down all before it. While we are made willing to destroy ourselves by *Rebellion*, at the Instigation of Cunning and Ambitious Men, we do it more effectually in one Day, than the bloodiest *Tyrant* could find in his heart to do in his whole Reign. All the Men put to Death by the Arbitrary Command of *Tyrants*, since the Beginning of the World, will not amount to half the Number of those who perish'd in the *Roman* or *English* Civil Wars. So much safer are we in God's Hand, or in those where God has placed us, than in our own! For God has promis'd to keep the Hearts of Kings in His Hand, and turn them as He pleaseth. *Prov. xxi. 1.* We have more Promises of Safety there, than when we are delivered over to the *Beasts of the People*, whose Madness *David* compares to the *Raging of the Sea*. In short, the Restraint of Government is the true *Liberty* and *Freedom* of the People; and that foolish Notion of *Liberty*, which is generally thought to consist in being free from the Lash of Government, as School-boys from their Master, proves only a Liberty to destroy one another. And yet to purchase this, our Author thinks it worth while to destroy one Half of the Nation. These are his Words, *To lose even Half of the Subjects in a Civil War, is more tolerable than the Loss of Liberty.* Here is a terrible Sentence! But observe his Reasons. *An Age or two will repair the Loss of Subjects— but if Liberty be lost, it is never to be retrieved.* This is monstrous. Men may be rescued from *Prison*, but not from *Death*; and *Liberty* may be retriev'd, but *Lives* never. He says, *An Age or two will repair the Loss of Lives,*
that

that is, Other Men will live. But does that retrieve those that are lost ? If the *Irish Protestants* did not lose their *Liberty* under K. James, his whole Book is false. If they did, did not K. W. retrieve it ? If not, let him answer his own Thanksgiving Sermon. But if K. W. did retrieve their lost *Liberty*, then his Position is false, That *Liberty lost is never to be retriev'd*. But the Reason of this strange Assertion is plainly hinted in these Words ; viz. *And indeed the greatest Mischief of a Civil War, is the Danger of subjecting the State to the Absolute Power of some potent General, as it happen'd at Rome, Florence, and in England, in the Late Civil Wars*. This indeed is the Mischief and Danger of a Civil War. For we cannot take Arms against a *Tyrant*, but under the Command of some General ; and who knows, but he may prove a *Tyrant* too ? It is too natural for Men to affect Absoluteness. Few love to be control'd ; yet we must be under the Power of some or other ; and the Effect of a Revolution is but changing the Person ; wherein we must run a Hazard. For the Cure is uncertain, but the Danger and Mischief is certain. It is the Fate of them that rebel for Liberty, to be enslav'd by their Deliverers. And then, according to our Author's Doctrine of Halving, Half the People must be destroy'd by a new Deliverer, to gain Liberty to the other Half. And if they be mistaken in the Man, then Half of the remaining Half must go : And if they be mistaken again, then half of that Half ; and so on for ever. This is your Author's Receipt for Liberty. This he says, is for the Good of the People. Of which People, I beseech you ? Of those that are kill'd to gain Liberty for the rest ? For we must compute from the *Major Part*. This is a very Unmathematical Way of Reckoning. For if Half the People be destroy'd to purchase Liberty to the rest, here is no Good, but *Hurt* done to the People : Because there

is greater *Hurt* done to one Half of the People, than their fancy'd *Good* can be to the other. I suppose our Author is one of the surviving Half, for whose Liberty the other Half was destroy'd. To trace this Argument of Halving home, would be to reduce the whole World to One Man at last.

The Miseries of Civil War are infinite ; and if a History were written of the Mischiefs of *Liberty* and *Property*, under the Pretence of *Publick Good*, I'll engage the World has suffer'd more Visible Mischiefs by this one Method, than by all the Wickedness of Mankind put together ; and that the Evils of a Civil War are infinitely less *Tolerable*, and bring a more *Universal* Ruin to the People, than any *Tyranny* of Lawful Governors that ever was in the World.

But of all Pretences for Rebellion, *Religion* is the most Ridiculous : For a Civil War introduces greater Immoralities, loosens the Reins of Discipline, and is more contrary to the Spirit of *True Religion*, than any thing in the World. The most Profligate and Licentious Court bears no Proportion in Wickedness to the *Lewdness*, *Blasphemy*, and *Contempt* of all that is sacred ; which reigns in a Camp.

This was verify'd in the *Protestant* Army in *Ireland*, which grew so scandalous, that our Author express'd his Indignation against the bare-fac'd Debauchery of the Army, from his Pulpit in *Dublin*. The Truth is, That Army debauched generally all that they left alive in that Kingdom ; and have left the Marks of their Wickedness as deeply imprinted in that Country, as their Plunder, Burning, and and other Acts of Violence. The Spirit of *Atheism* is let loose : It is the Common-Place of all our Men of Wit, to ridicule Holy Scriptures, and all Reveal'd Religion ; and this publicly in Coffee-Houses, every where, without Restraint, or Shame. And this

this was the Advantage Religion gain'd by the Wars in *Ireland*.

But it's no matter, so we beat down *Popery*. And yet *Popery* was never more tolerated in *Ireland*, than since the Conclusion of the War against *Popery* there, even by the Articles and Agreements of the War. And how freely it was after tolerated in *England*, we all know. Several turn'd *Papists* from the Scandal of the *Revolution*; nay, tho' it may seem a Paradox, yet it is true, That there were more Converts to *Popery*, in *England*, the First Four Years of the *Revolution*, than in the Four Years before.

All that *K. James* did, prov'd to be the Ruin of *Popery* in *England*. And had he gone on, he had turn'd all *English* Hearts for ever against it. But it's well if the Methods us'd to keep it out, do not bring it in. Sword-Reformations, especially, of Subjects against their Sovereigns, commonly end in the Ruin of those good Things which are made the Pretences. But after all this, would it not become our Author to lay aside the Statesman, and act his own part, that of a Divine? And herein I would presume to mind him of the Care of *Souls*. 'Tis much to be fear'd, Sir, in this great Slaughter you make of Bodies, some *Souls* will be lost: And an Age or two will not repair that. In this Quarrel, Sir, you cannot suppose Both Parties to be in the Right. There must be Rebels on one Side or t'other. And you us'd to tell us that *Rebellion* was a *Damning Sin*. And is it nothing to send so many *Souls* to Hell? This is propagating Religion by the Sword, beyond the Principles of *Mahomet*. But will an Age or two cure the Infection of Universal Debauchery and Prophaneness, which this Civil War produc'd in these Nations? For it was ever observ'd of War in all Ages, that it destroys Men's Principles, instills a Dissoluteness of Life, and then an Insensibility and Disregard of Religion, and of all Rules of Justice,

flow in of Course. But no sort of War is so prolific in the Corruption of Manners, as a Rebellious War, nor sticks longer to our Posterity, in a Poisonous Tainted Descent. This made our Forefathers wisely chuse the *Worst Peace*, before the *Best War*. Besides, as a Divine, our Author should have consider'd how God threaten'd to visit *the Sins of the Fathers upon the Children, to the Third and Fourth Generation*. His Blood be upon us and our Children (*Matt. xxvii. 25.*) lies heavy upon the *Jews* to this Day. And, Sir, that Ocean of Blood spilt in one of your Revolutions, must lye at some Door or other. An Age or two will not do away the Guilt of this. I fear, the Blood of *Charles* the Martyr, and all shed in that *Rebellion* against him, lies still upon these Nations: They cannot repent, whilst they maintain the same Principles that rais'd that Rebellion. And therefore we have but small hopes, that this Age is yet freed from the Blood shed in those Ages.

The Considerations I would recommend to our Author's Second Thoughts are these, *viz.* That Children may not only suffer Temporal Punishments for the Sins of their Fathers; but that really Men may make other Mens Sins their own, by approving and encouraging them; but by consenting to them: As *St. Paul* reckon'd himself guilty of *St. Stephen's* Murther, because he only held the Cloaths of them that stoned him. This I would have him consider, that he may have a View of the vast Sin he has run himself into, if his New Principles do not hold.

It is dangerous to transmit any thing to Posterity in Writing, which may in the least favour any Sin, especially that of *Blood*, which never ceases to cry, till it be avenged: And the greater Credit our Author's Book has with some sort of People, its Infection will be the greater, and he have the more to answer for. Therefore he ought to be very sure, that his Reasons are very good, because upon them
he

he pawns the Salvation of his own Soul, and of many Millions.

He says, *p. 3. n. 3.* “ If we look into History, “ we shall find the Best, the Happiest, and most “ Prosperous People, most jealous of their Liberty ; “ and while they continue firm in their Resolution “ of maintaining it, against the Encroachments of “ their Governors, even with the Hazard of their “ Lives, they have continued Great and Happy. This is absolutely false. For *Plutarch*, in the Life of *Timoleon*, says, *That the SICILIANS would not trust him, because they had been betray’d, and ill treated by CALIPPUS the ATHENIAN, and PHARAX the LACEDEMONIAN Captain ; both which gave out they came to introduce LIBERTY, and to depose TYRANTS, out-did the SICILIAN TYRANTS in Oppression and Cruelty.* And *Lucan* reckoning over the Miseries of the Civil Wars of *Rome*, which were all for *Liberty*, envies the happy Condition of those who live under *Absolute Tyrannies*, and cries,

*Felices Arabes, Mediæq; Æaq; Tellus,
Quam sub perpetuis tenuerunt Fata Tyrannis.*

The Fate of *Holland* will be no Exception, their Histories are cramm’d with innumerable Slaughters of many Years Civil Wars, all occasioned by their Contests for Liberty against the Crown of *Spain*, whose Subjects they were. They have ever since liv’d in Continual War with their Neighbours, and have been kept up chiefly as a Ballance ’twixt Contending Princes. It was but in *Q. Elizabeth’s* Time that they styl’d themselves *Poor Distressed States* ; and it’s not many Years since we saw *France* in Possession of most of their Towns, and had been of all the rest, had not *K. Ch. II.* interpos’d and rescu’d them.

We cannot easily compute the Success of this Commonwealth, which has ow’d it’s Life to the

Contention of it's Neighbours; and by Foreign War secures Peace at home, which lasts no longer than they can have leisure to worry one another, and shew the natural Effects of *Popular Government*, which was worthily celebrated in *Mobbing the De Witts*, and will shew itself again when there shall be Occasion. If our Author will alledge that they took Arms; to ease themselves of the heavy *Taxes* impos'd by their Kings; I shall tell him, That they have paid much greater *Taxes* to their Deliverers than to their Kings. But they fought for *Religion* as well as *Taxes*; and they have what they fought for: For they pay the greatest *Taxes* in the World, and have got all the *Religions* in the World. Their *Church* is calculated for *Trade*; and has no Authority but what the *States* allow. Their *Clergy* are the Tools of the *State*, and may be call'd a *Committee* or *Corporation* of *Religion*; but deserve not the Name of a *Church*, who can forfeit their *Charter* to the *State*, and are dismissable by them at pleasure. If our Author will say they grow rich by these means, I deny it: For their Scituation, Soil, and other Circumstances, force them to Industry. They must work, starve, or drown; and God has brought them under that happy Necessity, to shew the World an Example, what Industry alone can do, *without the Assistance of any other Vertue*. Therefore their Case will not be a Rule to other Nations.

But our Author says, That at this Day—— we shall find every Nation Happy and Thriving—— according as they have preserved themselves from Slavery. If he means Ireland, that indeed had glorious Effects of Happiness and Thriving to shew, being reduced to a Wilderness, from a Noble and Plentiful Country; one Half of the Souls in it perish'd, and all impoverish'd, upon the Pretence of preserving themselves from Slavery. He says, All Countries under Unlimited Monarchies, decay in their Strength and Improvements.

This

This is asserting and not proving, and is our Author's general Way of laying down his Positions, which he would have you believe without examining; for let him take a View of all those happy Countries that are under the Government of Unlimited Monarchies, and he will find none will be of his Opinion, but those who think there is no *Liberty* but in being free from Government, tho' they are thereby expos'd to the *Lawless* and *Arbitrary* Attempts of their *Equals* or *Inferiors*. But this they think not of, so they may not be under their *Lawful Superiors*.

You have seen already the Bent and Force of our Author's Arguments, *viz.* That King who designs to destroy one part of his People, does thereby *abdicate* the Government of them. But K. James had this design against the *Protestants* of Ireland, *ergo*, he proves that K. James had this design, Chap. 2. whose Title is, *That K. James design'd to destroy the Protestant Religion*. This is no Consequence. For suppose he might design to root out the *Protestant Religion* (which we do not find he ever did) yet not the Persons of the *Protestants*. All Governments set up some Religion, as the Establish'd Religion of their Country; and all that are in earnest with their Religion, wish all others to be of their Religion: But that therefore they would *destroy all*, who will not be of their Religion, is our Author's Consequence; which if false, there is no Argument in his Book.

England, no doubt, would rid it self of *Popeery*; to which end, it is made *Treason* to turn *Papist*, and their *Priests* are banish'd upon Pain of Death; and the Law debars *Papists* from Places of Trust, and many Advantages, which other Subjects enjoy. But that therefore the Government intends to cut the Throats of all the *Papists* in England, or those that have submitted in Ireland, and therefore has *abdicated* the Government of them, is our Author's Doctrine; and for which the Government, instead
of

of thanking him, would look on him as an Invidious, Seditious, and Treasonable Incendiary, who would make the Government odious, and stir up the Subjects to Rebellion. For by this Rule, the *Episcopal Party* in *Scotland* may justify their taking Arms every Day, in opposition to the present Settlement of that Kingdom; for they have suffer'd more from the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland*, than even this Author was afraid of from *K. James* in *Ireland*. In short, his Doctrine will justify all Rebellions in the World, for none can want the Pretences he allows for Rebellion. But above all, it gives a full Liberty to all *Dissenters* in Religion, to take up Arms against the Government; whom if they exclude Places of Trust, it shall be improv'd into a Design for their Destruction: But if a *Penal Law* be made against them, then the Design is apparent, nay 'tis a real Attempt upon them, &c.

But above all things, how could the *Irish* who adher'd to *K. James*, be made Rebels to *K. W.* before they submitted to him? Can this be done by your Principles? If you say he had a Title to *Ireland*, as it is an Appendix to the Crown of *England*; I answer; But from the Beginning it was not so; and the Government of *England* being dissolved (as you say) by *Abdication*, and return'd back to the Suppos'd *Original Contract*, or *First Right of Mankind*, to erect Government for their own Convenience; of consequence the Tye which *England* had upon *Ireland* was dissolv'd, and *Ireland*, as well as *England*, left in her suppos'd *Original Freedom* to chuse her own Government or Governors. Nor was *K. W.* oblig'd to this Author's Principles, which freed the *Irish* from him, because of the Presumption they had to think he intended to invade their Property, Lives, and Religion. He declar'd he came to establish the *Protestant Religion*. But in his Declaration of Grace, 7. July, 1690. he pardons none but only *Poor Labourers*,
Common

common Soldiers, Country Farmers, Plowmen and Cottiers, and such Citizens, Townsmen, Tradesmen and Artificers, who should return by the first of August. And by the publick Resolution of his Judges, 21 Nov. 1690. very few had hopes of either Life or Estate, pursuant to his Declarations, even upon their Submission to him. And notwithstanding these, and General Ginckle's Proclamation printed at Dublin Feb. 4. 1690. that assur'd the Irish Papists in their Majesty's Names, that if they would submit, they should be protected in their Religion, Estates, and Liberties, multitudes of Out-lawrys, Forfeitures, and other Proceedings were issued against them. Had our Author the improving of these Circumstances, with the addition of the Argument of Glenco, how easily could he argue them into the Lawfulness of Arming in their own Defence? He would summon the Nation to rise as one Man, and Abdicate all the Governments in the World. Our Author has had the Character of a Man of good Reason; but in this Book his Zeal has transported him to take that for Reason, which is the furthest from it.

C. 3. f. 8. n. 6. p. 102. His justifying the Town of Derry shutting their Gates against the E. of *Antrim's* Regiment, and proving they were oblig'd to do so by their Foundation, makes K. James I. who gave them their Charter, grant a Charter against himself: Whereas Derry was built as a Security against the Rebellious Natives in those Parts.

C. 3. f. 12. n. 16. p. 134. He enlarges on the Reasons the *Irish*, as well as *English* had to dread *Papists* in a Parliament, and grounds it on Q. Mary's House of Commons; But that Parliament did overturn the *Protestant Religion*, yet the Protestants thought it their Duty for Conscience sake to suffer Martyrdom, rather than Arm against their *Popish* Governours.

The Argument he uses to cure the Folly of those *Jacobites* who were attainted in the Act of Attainder in *Ireland*, and yet continue *Jacobites*, is as ill chosen

chosen as any of the rest, supposing Mankind to be void of *Charity, Honour and Conscience.*

C. 3. f. 17. n. 7. He says, K. James claim'd a *Despotick Power* over the Church because (the Bishop being fled) he appointed a Chancellor in the Diocess of *Dublin*, (who our Author confesses went no further than the *Probat of Wills*) But if K. James had by mere *Lay-Authority* deprived the *English and Irish* Bishops and Clergy, and overthrown *Episcopacy* in *Scotland*, what would not our Author have said? Why truly he would have been as unmannerly and scurrilous as he was to the Depriv'd Bishops, particularly the Bishop of *Galloway*. He (K. J.) appointed (says our Author) one GORDON, who call'd himself Bishop of *GALLOWAY* in *SCOTLAND*, to be Chancellor in the Diocess of *DUBLIN*. This GORDON was a very ignorant, lewd Man, and a profest *PAPIST*. Which is scandalously false, for he was all along a profest *Protestant*, and a Man of Learning and Parts.

We come now to this Author's Defence of his Principles from his *Quotations* and *Authorities*; in which we'll begin with the Scripture. And here he is modest, for he says no more than that he is apt to believe that the Reasons for *Non-Resistance* from Scripture reach only *Tolerable Evils*. *Intro. n. 3. p. 3.* but he does not answer, nor so much as name any of those Texts, which he knows are urg'd for *Non-Resistance*. Only at the end of this n. 3. p. 4. he says there was a *Tacit Exception* in the Command of the *Sabbath* for Works of Necessity and Mercy; and therefore infers, that it may be so too in the Command for *Obedience to Governours*; tho' the Command be in general Words, without any Exception, expressed. *It being as true*, says he, *That Governours were made for their Kingdoms, as the Sabbath for Man.* This I grant; but I must likewise say, that it is for the good of the People, nor to have that Latitude of flying in the Face of Government upon any Pre-

tence

tence whatever ; because such Sentences, and Instruments to put them in Practice will never be wanting ; and a Civil War is of worse Consequence than any Male-Administration of Government can be.

I grant our Author's Exception in the Scripture for Works of Mercy on the Sabbath : But let him produce any Exceptions in Scripture from the General Command of Obedience to Governours, and they will be allow'd, otherwise this Instance is of no use ; as several others of his are.

I shall only give some few Examples, which may answer to the very *Hypothesis* our Author sets up, viz. The Supposition of a King, *designing to destroy one main part of his Subjects in favour of another, whom he loves better, and of submitting to tolerable Evils, &c.*

1. The first Instance is that of the *Jews* in *Egypt*. They were a People as different from the *Egyptians*, as the *Irish* from the *English*, only they liv'd more like an independent People than the *Irish*, and unmix'd with the *Egyptians*, having the Land of *Goshen* assign'd them particularly to themselves. And yet they suffer'd the greatest Oppression from their King. His Design to ruin them was apparent, destroying their very Children, and they had given no Provocations on their side. They durst not Sacrifice to the Lord without danger of being Ston'd, so that they were oppress'd most Tyrannically in their Religion as well as in their Persons, which were condemn'd to the *Brick-Kilns*. They were able to have deliver'd themselves, being an Army of 600000 Men ; and tho' God sent *Moses* to deliver them, yet he would not suffer *Moses* to do it till *Pharaoh* gave them leave to depart.

2. When the *Jews* were subjected to the King's of *Babylon*, and instigated by false Prophets rebell'd against them, they were condemn'd by *Jeremy*, who during their Captivity directed them to live in Subjection

jection and Obedience, till the King gave them leave to depart. See Bishop *Overal's* Convocation Book. c. 28 p 58.

3. The same Convoc. Book c. 33. p. 77. says, that the *immediate and apparent* Cause of the Destruction of the *Jews*, was their obstinate Rebellion against the Emperors of *Rome*, their lawful Governours. We see how God blessed the *Jews* when they were dutiful to their Lawful Princes, who *designed, attempted, and almost effected* their Destruction and Extirpation; and on the other Hand how he visited their Rebellion against their lawful Governours, tho' for the preservation of their *Religion, Liberty, Property, and their very Lives*.

4. No less than a *Massacre* of the whole *Jewish Nation*, was not only *design'd*, but *expresly order'd* by *Abasuerus*, and yet they did not take Arms in their Defence till the King's Letters gave them leave to stand for their Life. Esther, 8. 11.

5. *Saul's Design* upon the *Gibeonites*, 1 Sam. 21. 22. was plain, and a very paralel Case with the *Irish*.

6. But to come down to Christianity. No sooner did Christianity appear in the World, but all Kings and Powers fell on the Professors of it, to root them off from the Face of the Earth, using the utmost Barbarities and Cruelties against them. And yet they took not Arms to preserve themselves; they were totally barr'd from that Method. *Damnation* was the Portion of those that resisted their *Lawful Governours*. They did not judge with our Author, that their Kings had *abdicated* the Government of those whom they design'd to Destroy. They were taught to own them as God's *Deputies*, and as such to obey them, and to suffer what they inflicted without *Re-viling* or *Threatning*. And this was not for want of Power to do otherwise, but for *Conscience-sake*. *Tertullian* told the Emperor it was not for want of
Numbers

Numbers that they did not defend themselves, for the Christians fill'd his Armies, his Cities, his very Court, but it was from the Principles of their Religion, which would not allow them to take Arms against their Lawful Prince tho' a Persecutor. I need not mind my Author of this or many more Instances, he has taught them often and zealously.

What he cites out of the Author of *Jovian* in the First Chapter is against him, for that Author there shews, that Resistance *would be a greater Mischief than Passive Obedience.* Grotius confesses the same, and both without their relation only to private Injuries, and the ordinary Mal-administration of Government.

It may be material to know what the Homilies make for his Purpose, because they are confirm'd by Act of Parliament and Convocation, which this Author and all the Clergy have subscribed; and which *Julian Johnson* himself, the Patron of Resistance says, is *next best Book to the Bible.*

The First Homily against *Wilful Rebellion*, tells us nothing is so bad or mischiveous to a Country as Resistance, be the King ever so Wicked, Foolish, Covetous, &c. The Second Homily enlarges upon the Case of *Saul* and *David*; and after stating the several Pretences for Rebellion, says, Let their King be *Wicked, Unkind, Cruel, out of Favour with God,* &c. he is not to be resisted. And to shew that all this is not meant only of particular Persons, but of the whole Nation, it is thus expressed at the end of this Homily, viz. *That the whole Jewish Nation (being otherwise a stubborn People) were to be Obedient to the Commandment of a Foreign Prince, and this proves Christian Rebels to be far worse than Jews.* In the Fourth Homily having shewn the horrible Destruction of *Corah, Dathan* and *Abiram*, and others for their Rebellions and Murmurings, it inveighs bitterly against those that Arm and Head Rebels a-
gainst

gainst their Prince and Country. These Homilies are worthy our strictest Regard; and I cannot see for what end our Author should so gravely vouch them on his side, which are so opposite to his Meaning and Practice. Observe his Confidence, and trust him not.

After what he offers from Reason, Scripture, the Homilies, and Publick Acts of our Church, he comes to private Writers. He begins with *Grotius*, Introd. n. 1. p. 2. This is *Grotius's* Opinion, says our Author, in his Book *de Jure Belli & Pacis*, lib. 1. cap. 4. § 11. where citing *Barclay*, he says, " If a
 " King be carried away with a malicious Design
 " to the Destruction of a whole Nation, he loseth
 " his Kingdom, which I grant, since a Will to Go-
 " vern and to Destroy cannot consist together, there-
 " fore he, who professes himself an Enemy to a whole
 " People, doth in that very Act Abdicate his King-
 " dom: But it seems hardly possible, that it should
 " enter into the Heart of a King, who is not
 " Mad, if he govern only one People; but if he
 " govern many, it may happen, that in favour of
 " one People, he may desire the other were de-
 " stroy'd." This is our Author's Quotation. To which I reply in the first Place, that he has not been just in his Translation, For the Case *Grotius* cites out of *Barclay* is, *Si Rex verè Hostili animâ*, if a King with a *Hostile Mind*, that is, as an *Open Enemy*, in *totius populi exitium feratur*, be bent upon the Destruction of his whole People. Now the Words *Hostile Mind* our Author softens, by rendring them, *Malice in his Mind, a malicious Design*; which may be easier inferr'd from a Hundred Things, than an *Open hostile Attempt* to cut off a whole Nation. But this Design of Destroying a whole Nation, *Grotius* says, is hardly to be supposed to enter into the Heart of a King in his Wits. And therefore is of no use to our Author, neither does he so much as pre-
 tend

tend it against K. James, but only that he design'd to destroy the *Protestant* Interest in *Ireland*.

As for that other Part of what *Grotius* says, viz. That if a King govern many People, it may happen that in Favour of one People he may desire the other were Destroy'd. But *Grotius* subjoins his Reason for this, which our Author (not like an honest Translator) leaves out, which is, *Ut Colonias ibi faciat*; that he may plant a Colony there. And this no reasonable Man will stretch further, than to bring the Natives under *Subjection*, where he intends to plant a Colony, not to destroy them all. Observe, our Author has quited all the Words of that Section out of *Grotius*, but *ut Coloniam ibi faciat*; which are the last Words of it. But this Passage of *Grotius* will no way serve our Author's Purpose, unless he prove K. James not only design'd, but profess'd himself an Enemy to his People; nor can he make him to have *Abdicated* by this Quotation, unless he make him to be Mad at the same time.

His next Authority is Dr. *Hammond*; who says, That *Grotius* mentions some Cases, wherein a King may be resisted, as in Case a King shall *Abdicate* his Kingdom, and manifestly *Relinquish* his Power, then he turns Private Man, and may be dealt with as any other such. Dr. *Hammond* cites *Grotius* indeed, but I would ask our Author whether he approves of what he says? Or supposing a King to reduce himself by *Abdication* to the State of a private Man, does it therefore follow that because a Private Man may be resisted; therefore it is lawful to resist a King? But our Author has no reason to hug himself in this Quotation; for Dr. *Hammond* writes diametrically opposite to our Author's Principle, and vindicates *Grotius* for asserting, That neither publick nor private Persons may lawfully wage War against them under whose Command they are; and That it was the greatest Injury that could be done to the *Antient Christians*, to say, That it was

Want of Strength, not of Inclination that way, that they defended not themselves in time of most certain Danger of Death. And much more to the same purpose.

The next Authority our Author makes use of, is as unlucky for his Design. It is Dr. *Hicks*, Dean of *Worcester*, who wrote *Jovian*, in answer to *Julian* the Apostate. He is now one of the Depriv'd Clergy of this Kingdom, for his constant adhering to his old *Passive Obedience*. Yet this Author will needs quote him on his Side; to make the World believe that the Book that Author wrote, in defence of *Passive Obedience*, is against it.

Our Author states the Question thus; *Suppose a King endeavours to destroy his People; by which we must mean the Whole People, as already shewn out of Grotius; or if he would have it meant only of a Part of the People, he should tell us what Part, that we might know his Meaning. But he is at his Generals, in which 'tis harder to know where to have him, than to confute him.*

But to the Case in hand: *Jovian* says, *That to suppose this, is plainly to suppose the utmost Impossibility.* But supposing it, our Author quotes him again, and says, in such a Case, *his Subjects would desert him.* By which he means no more, as he here explains himself, than not assisting him in such wicked Designs; which is certainly the part of a good Subject. But what's this to *deposing, abdicating, arming against him, &c.* But he goes on with *Jovian*, and quotes p. 152, where he says, *He should be tempted to pray for the Destruction of such a Prince.* Here our Author plays his old Trick of concealing; for the Words just before this Quotation say, *That all this was upon the Supposition of such a Prince as Julian, who had sinned against a Series of divine Miracles, and had discover'd such a Diabolical Malice against Christ, that without Breach of Charity he might be supposed, upon Scripture Principles, to have sinned against*

against the Holy Ghost, and become incapable of Repentance. And upon that Supposition, says *Jovian*, I should be tempted to pray for his Destruction, as the only means of delivering the Church. There being no other way of Deliverance for the Church from Persecution; but by God's converting or removing the Persecutor, who was our *Lawful Gouverneur*. But let our Author take this as he will, 'tis plain *Dr. Hicks* does not determine, unless it be in the Negative: He says he should be tempted to pray so; and that you must do no more than Pray. These are the Words which follow those this Author has quoted. I must also declare, says he, that I would do nothing but pray against him. I would draw forth no Squadrons against him, but those of Prayers and Tears. I would dye rather than resist him, or those that were in Authority under him. Why should our Author leave out these Words of *Dr. Hicks*, which shew his Principle in this matter? But this is like his Way of amusing, instead of informing.

His Citation of *Falkner* is of no service; for in his *Christian Loyalty*, B. 2. c. 5. n. 19, 20. he has these Words, But if ever any such strange Case should happen, I confess it would have its great Difficulties. Who ever doubted it? I cannot imagine what he brought this for. But *Dr. Falkner*, *ibid.* § 2. n. 20. sets the whole matter in a true light. In truth, says he, the Case abovemention'd ought not at all to be suppos'd; for there is greater Hurt to be feared from the making such Suppositions, than from the Things supposed, &c. And as much against our Author's Purpose, as if he had written it in Answer to our Author.

He likewise cites *Falkner*, B. 2. c. 5. n. 1. to the same purpose, as he did *Dr. Hammond* before, viz. That the Person who was King may be resisted, when he does voluntarily relinquish his Power, and becomes a Private Person, for then indeed, *ipso jure*, he of Right ceases to be a King. I cannot conceive

where our Author must lick up these Principles of Government, except from the *Scotch Presbyterian Minister*, in his Answer to the Objection in the 23. Chapter of their Confession of Faith, upon the Head of the Civil Magistrate, *viz. That Infidelity, or Difference in Religion, does not take away a King's Right to his Crown, nor absolve his Subjects from their Allegiance to him.* The Minister reply'd, *That is true; for if a King turn Infidel, he does ipso facto cease to be a King.* So that our Author is not the Original of this pretty *Distinction*.

And these are the Supports of our Author's new *Hypothesis*. From all which I would only mind him of the Instances I have given, *viz. The Condition of the Jews in Egypt, in Babylon, under Ahasuerus, and the Romans: The Gibeonites under Saul; and the Primitive Christians under their several Persecutions.* And then apply this to the Rule he has given us, *viz. That Non-Resistance does reach only Tolerable Evils, and where the Mischief is not Universal.* What would our Author think or say of the Case of the *Protestants* under *Q. Mary*, who was as much bigotted as *K. James*? She overturn'd Religion by Law; set up Fire and Faggot; broke her Promise to her *Protestant Subjects*, that brought her to the Throne; imprison'd her Sister, the only *Protestant Branch* of the Royal Family. And yet the Martyrs in those Days, at the Stake, declared it not lawful to take Arms against the Queen, in defence of their Religion. They did not plead their Evil was intolerable, when they were going into the Fire; or that it was universal, when it reach'd their Religion all over the Kingdom. These Men were too dull to find out these Excuses to save their Lives and Religion.

We will now consider our Author's Matters of Fact.

Good Men may err in *Judgment*, but they who wilfully mistake in *Matters of Fact*, are past all Excuse ; especially where they protest before God, as this Author does, p. 239. That they have not *aggravated* nor *mis-represented* any thing against their Adversaries.

After K. James came in Person into *Ireland*, there was no Act which was properly to be call'd his, that was not all Mercy and Goodness to the *Protestants*. Of which you shall see several Instances: I cannot say I have examin'd into every Single Matter of Fact which this Author relates ; but I am sure I have the most material ; and by these you will judge of his Sincerity in the rest.

We will begin with that Matter of Fact that is of most Importance ; that is, Who were the Aggressors in *Ireland*, in that miserable Destruction brought upon that Kingdom, and begun *An. 1688*. Our Author positively avers, c. 3. § 8. n. 3. p. 98. *That it was the unanimous Resolution of all the Protestants in the Kingdom (of Ireland) that they would not be the Aggressors, and that they held stedfastly to their Resolution.* And yet in the same Sect. n. 9. p. 104. he tells of those who did not keep to that Resolution, and that by way of excuse he says, *The Shutting up of Derry against the E. of Antrim's Regiment, was all that was done by any Protestant, in opposition to the Government, till K. JAMES deserted England, except what was done at Eneskellin.* See Mr. *Hamilton*, who himself was there, in his *Actions of the Eneskillen-Men*, p. 3.

What does he mean by saying this was all ! Did he consider what Construction the Law put upon his All this ; viz. Seizing Forts, Lifting Soldiers, Marching in Arms against the King's Forces. Was this resolving not to be *Aggressors* ? Was this the deep Sense of Loyalty, &c. which made them abhor any thing that

that look'd like an *Insurrection*? As this Author expresses it just before, in the same Sect. n. 8.

Our Author's great Aim is to fix the time of the *Abdication* (as he calls it) as early as he can, to justify what was done in *Ireland*. But this cannot be said in his Sense, to commence, till it was declared in some *Convention, Parliament, or Judicial Manner*; before which Private Men could not lawfully act upon it: And this was not determin'd in the *Convention*, till *Febr. 1688*, long before which the *Irish Protestants* were in Arms. He may begin his Account where he will; but 'tis notoriously true, that K. J. did not leave *England* till 23. *Dec. 1688*. Therefore this will not excuse what the *Protestants* did in *Ireland* long before.

But I must take leave to put our Author in mind of what he cannot forget, and I have from Eye-Witnesses; viz. That long before K. J. left *England*, the *Protestants* in the North of *Ireland* were generally in Arms, officer'd and regimented, and had frequent *Rendezvouzes*: All which was *Treason* by the Law, tho' they had not entred upon any Action; and which none but our Author will deny to be in opposition to the Government.

But there were Preparations antecedent to the Resistance; for we are told in a Book intitled, *A Faithful History of the Northern Affairs of Ireland, &c.* That they began to arm and associate privately, about *Sept. 1688*. p. 7. In which the Lord B. in the Counties of *Armagh* and *Monaghan*, and Sir A. R. in *Down* and *Antrim*, appear'd most forward. This was when the Report of the P. of O's Expedition grew hot; then, says the foresaid Author, p. 6. They did presume too far upon the Opinion of their own Strength—— and rashly fancy'd they were able to attempt their Deliverance. You may believe this Author, for he bore a great share in those Transactions, and was no Friend, I assure you of K. J. The Reader may

may pick enough Matter of this sort out of him.

This was before P. O. landed in *England*; and about the End of *Nov. 1688.* when the News of his Landing reach'd *Ireland* (says Mr. Boyle, in his *Vindication of Mr. Osborn, p. 11.*) Mr. Osborn was entrusted by his Nonconformist Brethren, and other Gentlemen of Note and Interest in the Province of *Ulster*, to get some Body to go to the Prince with these Instructions.

1. **I**N our Name to congratulate the Arrival of P. O. into England, and his Success hitherto in so glorious an Undertaking, &c.

2. That you represent the Dangers and Fears of the Protestants in Ireland, and particularly in the Province of *Ulster*; and humbly beseech him speedily to relieve them.

3. That you represent our Readiness to serve him and his Interest, in the Prosecution of so glorious a Design, as far as we have Access.

Subscribed

Archibald Hamilton.
Alexander Osborne.

Accordingly, *Dec. 8.* they sent over a Gentleman, who deliver'd a Memorial on these Heads to P. O. The Originals of which, says Mr. Boyle, whose Words these are, are now in my hands.

This our Author knows was before K. James deserted *England*; and I hope he will not have the Assurance to say, that it was not done in opposition to the Government.

I will give one Instance more. This Author could not but know of the great Alarm of an Intended Massacre of the Protestants in *Ireland*, upon 9. of *Dec. 1688.* This arose from a Letter said to

be found in *Cumber-street*, which was carried to the E. of *M.* This flew as Credibly as the artificial Alarm in *England* of the few disbanded *Irish* that were to cut all their Throats there in one Night. When this News arrived in *Dublin* (as the *faithful History* before quoted tells us, p. 8.) the City was in the utmost Confusion, above 5000 Protestants appeared in Arms. And yet the same Historian says, he is very well assur'd that this was only a contrivance devised to oblige the E. of *M.* to engage in their *Association*, which he had before declin'd. But this sham Alarm drew him in, and he undertook to be their *General*; upon which the whole *North of Ireland* rose like one Man. This made *Derry* shut their Gates, and was the Occasion of all the Confusion that follow'd.

The Man they first pitcht on for their *General* was the E. of *Granard*. And accordingly Mr. *Hamilton* of *Tollemore* went to *Dublin*, to invite his Lordship to put himself at the Head of their Troops. But he knew better, than to undertake the Command of an undisciplin'd *Mob*. Besides, he told Mr. *Hamilton*, that he had liv'd *Loyal* all his Life, and was resolv'd, *That no Man should write Rebel upon his Grave-stone*. This he pursu'd, and dissuaded them from their mad Enterprize, wisely admonishing them of their sad Ruin, which afterwards came to pass, and sign'd several Proclamations, declaring them *Rebels*, and summoning them to lay down their Arms.

All that we have hitherto recounted, was before the *Convention* had declar'd *K. James's Recess* to be an *Abdication*, &c. For which I leave our Author to blush, if he can. For it's plain, that the shutting up of *Derry* against the E. of *Antrim's* Regiment, and *Eneskillen's* refusing to quarter two Companies sent them by the Lord Deputy, was not *all that was done by the Protestants in Ireland, in opposition to the Government, till K. James deserted England*.

But

But here is a more material Thing yet; and that is, the Descent of K. James's Army into the *North of Ireland* in *March 1688*. Our Author would make us believe, there was no Provocation given by the *Protestants*, that it was only a Design of my Lord Tyrconnel to involve the Kingdom in Blood, and that no Persuasions could prevail upon him to defer sending it till the King should come, least there should be any Terms propos'd or accepted by the People of the North, and so that Country escape being plunder'd and undone. This is in n. 10. §. 8. of ch. 3. p. 106. Our Author here tells us there was no Provocation for this Descent, and here p. 106. what was the true Cause of it. We will examine both.

For the first he asserts p. 105. *That the Protestants were not so much as summoned by the Lord Deputy*, and then he goes on, "Nor did they enter into any
 " Act of Hostility, or Association, or offend any
 " till assaulted. But finding continual Robberies
 " and Plunderings were committed by those the
 " Lord Deputy had entrusted with Arms and Em-
 " ployments, the Gentlemen in the *North* to pre-
 " vent their own Ruin, entred into *Associations* to
 " defend themselves from these Robbers; their *As-*
 " *sociations* did really reach no further than this;
 " nor did they attempt any thing upon these Arm-
 " ed Robbers, except in their own Defence. Nor,
 " says our Author, could I ever hear of one Act of
 " Hostility committed; wherein they were not on
 " the *Defensive* — This was all the Reason the Lord
 " Deputy had to call them Rebels in the Proclama-
 " tion, dated *March 7. 1688*. and to charge them
 " with killing the King's Subjects, and Pillaging
 " and Plundering the Country; whereas 'tis noto-
 " rious they kill'd none but whom they found actu-
 " ally Robbing — And for Plundering, it is no less
 " notorious, that they preserved the whole Coun-
 " try within their *Associations* from being pillaged,
 " when

“ when all the rest of *Ireland* was destroy’d. And
 “ their great Care of themselves and Country
 “ was the Crime which provoked the Lord Deputy
 “ and made him except from Pardon *Twelve* of the
 “ principal Eſtated Men in the *North*, when he ſent
 “ Lieutenant General *Hamilton* with an Army,
 “ which he tells us in the ſame Proclamation would
 “ inevitably occaſion the total Ruin of the *North*.

This is his Charge, and in his own Words. I
 will not take the Advantage of his miſ-quoting this
 Proclamation, which he might as well have put into
 his large Appendix, as ſome other unneceſſary things.
 But we have it printed in the *Apology for the Proteſ-*
ſtants of Ireland, &c. Our Author calls the excepted
 Perſons *Twelve*, whereas in the Proclamation they
 are but *Ten*. This does not enhance the Matter
 much. But it ſhews our Author no exact Man in
 his Vouchers, or elſe in reciting the Cauſes that Pro-
 clamation names for the Deſcent of that Army, he
 would have inſtanc’d in Particulars; ſuch as *Breaking*
of Priſons, Diſcharging of Priſoners, ſiezing upon his
Majeſty’s Arms and Ammunition, imprifoning ſeveral
of his Army, diſarming and diſmounting them, &c.
 But theſe he wiſely avoids naming; only in general,
 that the Proclamation charges them with Rebellion,
 Killing, Plundering, &c. Every word of which he
 denies.

As to the ſummoning of the *Aſſociators* in *Ulſter*
 before the Deſcent of the Army, ’tis certain the
 Lord Deputy did it no other way than by Proclama-
 tion; that of the 7th of *March*, which mentions a
 former one, requir’d the *Aſſociators* to diſperſe, and
 promis’d them Pardon. There was one of this Na-
 ture (perhaps more) dated 25 of *Jan.* 1688. ſigned
 by ſeveral Proteſtants of the Council, as the E. of
Granard, Lord chief Juſtice *Keating*, &c.

Beſides this the Lord Deputy ſent Mr. *Oſborn* into the
North, to tell them that tho’ *Ten* were excepted, yet
 if

if it appear'd they took up Arms meerly for Self-preservation, he would pardon all; demanding no more than their Arms and Serviceable Horses. See *Osborn's Letter to the Lord Massarene*, in the *Apolo-gy for the Protestants*.

To this the Lord Deputy offer'd by Sir *Robert Col-vil*, That if his Country-men would continue quiet in their respective Habitations, they should be only charg'd with Two Regiments. *Ibid.* p. 10. And this was long before the March of that Army into the *North*.

The next part of this Author's Charge is of the Great Robbers in the *North*. Not Common Highway-men; but such Armed Bands of Robbers as forc'd the whole *North* to arm and regiment themselves, and enter into *Associations* and *Confederacies*, and a Formal War, to defend themselves against these Robbers, who, says our Author, were Men entrusted by the Lord Deputy with Arms and Employments. And yet by all Accounts from the *North*, the *Irish* there were in such fear of the *Protestants*, that they durst not sleep in their Houses, but lay abroad in the Fields, lest they should fall upon them. There was no living without taking Protections from such of the *Protestant* Gentry, as were allowed by the *Associators* to grant them. They were forc'd to travel with Passes, to contribute to all their Levies, to work upon their new Fortifications, and submit to all the Insults of those who were absolutely their Masters, and who made a full use of their finding themselves at liberty from all Government. The *Faithful History* says, p. 9. *The North only remain'd undisturbed*. And our Author says, *The Protestants kept the whole Country within their Associations from being pillaged*. Where then were these great Robberies he speaks of? Our Author lays the Scene of them in the *North*, and yet he confesses, and many Witnesses attest, there was no such thing. Strange Contradictions! But, p. 100. he endeavours to prove it from

from Judge Keating's Letter. The Passage is this, p. 349. *In this Juncture of Affairs, the Thieves and Robbers are become numerous, &c.* But this Letter was dated 29. Dec. 1688. which was after their Associating and Arming in the North. And he says plainly, p. 348. *That the Protestants far exceeded them (the Irish) in the Northern Parts, and were extraordinarily well arm'd and hors'd.* So that in the North the Irish stood in fear of the Protestants, and therefore they could not be the Robbers. I shall not trouble the Reader with our Author's *Observations*, p. 100. which are nothing but mere Inconsistencies; for the *Odium* between the *Papists* and *Protestants* being aggravated to Extremity, and the *Protestants* by much superior to the *Papists*, it is not likely the *Protestants* stood in fear of the *Papists*.

Our Author says, *The Northern Associators gave the Government no other Provocation, than to defend themselves against those Robbers.* But I desire our Author to resolve, if the Beginning of their Associating, in Sept. 1688. and their actual Address to P. O. in Nov. following, was only to save themselves from Robbers? Again, he says, *The Associators never made any Attempt upon the Armed Robbers, but when they were invaded or assaulted by them.* This was modest indeed! But were they of *Eneskillen* invaded or assaulted by the Two Companies, against whom they marched out in Arms Four Miles, before they came near the Town? Or was *Derry* assaulted by My Lord *Antrim's* Regiment, before they fir'd their Cannon from the Walls against them?

Our Author says, *It's notorious that the Protestants never killed any, whom they did not find actually robbing.* But it's much more notoriously known, and granted by all the *Irish Protestants*, that on the 11. of Feb. 1688. Col. *Carrack O Neil's* Troop of Dragoons was dispers'd, and several of them kill'd by the Protestant Forces at *Tuam* upon *Loughneagh* (tho' the

the Col. was a profess'd *Protestant*.) This Colonel having had frequent Notice, that Sir *Arthur Rawden* (for his Forwardness in promoting the *Association* call'd the *Cock of the North*) intended to seize him in his House, retired to *Carrickfergus*, where part of his Regiment was quarter'd, leaving his Lady at his House, with the Chaplain of the Regiment, Mr. *Maurice Dunkin*, Vicar of *Glanarme*, in the County of *Antrim*, thinking she might be safe under his Protection. The Lady hearing that the Associates had fall'n on her Husband's Troop of Dragoons at *Tuam*, retir'd to the House of Mr. *White*, a *Presbyterian* Minister of *Borough-shane*, who did protect her, tho' not without Difficulty, from a Regiment of the Confederates, under the Command of Mr. *Adare* (then made a Col. by P. O. and afterwards knighted by K. W.) These march'd thro' *Borough-shane* to the Siege of *Carrickfergus*, upon *Ash-Wednesday*, 13. *Feb.* 1688. and would needs rifle this Lady, because she was a *Rom. Catholick*, and her Husband a Col. in *Carrickfergus*: Mr. *Dunkin*, for endeavouring to dissuade them, was robb'd and stripp'd, as was his Man, and one Mr. *Arthur Dobbing*; And had broke into the House, and robb'd her, if not worse, had not Mr. *White* interpos'd, who led her, half dead with Fear, to her Coach, and conducted her to *Shanes-Castle*, the Seat of the Lady Marchioness of *Antrim*. However, tho' she escap'd, they plunder'd the House, leaving nothing they could find, belonging to the Col. or her. This was on the 13. of *Feb.* the Anniversary of which Day was celebrated with the Sacrifice of *Glenco* in *Scotland*, 13. *Feb.* 1692.

As for the Siege of *Carrickfergus*, I leave it to the Chronicle, and shall only observe, that 21. of *Feb.* 1688. being disappointed of the Surrender of the Place, they only grac'd their Retreat with certain Ridiculous Articles not worth mentioning.

The

The same Fortune attended their Designs on the Garrisons of *Newry* and *Charlмонт*, and other Attempts, except My Lord *Blaynie's* surprizing a Troop of Dragoons at *Armagh*, whom they disarm'd, took their Horses, and made the Officers Prisoners. I would ask our Author whether these Men were actually *robbing*, whom they surpriz'd in their Beds, or *careless* in their Guard-House?

But they were not so lucky in their Design upon Sir *Tho. Newcomen's* Regiment at *Lisburn*, tho' several of the Officers were in the Plot.

Now let our Author judge if this was only acting upon the *Defensive*, never attempting any thing, but in their own Defence, *when invaded or assaulted by Robbers*: Which he asserts as a notorious Truth.

The Prison at *Cavan* was broke open, and the Prisoners set at Liberty by the *Associators*. The like was done in many more, or most of the Northern Counties. Of which the Lord Deputy complain'd, in the same Proclamation, which our Author cites, of the 7. of *Mar.* 1688. Our Author should have consider'd, whether these Prisoners or their Creditors were actually *robbing* or *assaulting* these *Associators*, and whether this was no Offence, without Law to release, Debtors, Fellons, Thieves, and Murderers? As likewise their Ordering the Collectors of the King's Revenue, to bring in to them the King's Money (after the Example of their Friends in *England*) *being for Their Majesties Service*.

But to make an End of this Point, *viz.* *Whether the Northern Associators gave no Provocation to the Government, before the Descent of the Army, in March, 1688. than to defend themselves against Robbers?* Before this Army came down, they had receiv'd Commissions from P. O. even before he was declar'd King in *England*, as appears from a Subaltern's Commission, which I have seen, bearing date *Feb. 5. 1688.* These Commissions were brought over by
Capt.

Capt. *Leighton*, whom the Associators sent to the Prince. In short they not only acted by these Commissions, but proclaim'd the P. King, before the Descent of that Army. This I think was something higher than a bare Defence against Robbers. And now judge whether the Lord Deputy and Council had not reason to call them *Rebels*, and to send that Army to reduce them? Yet this Author inveighs from p. 111. to 117. most bitterly against the Government, for disarming the *Protestants* in *Dublin*, 24. Feb. 1688. and again by K. James's Proclamation, 20. Jul. 1689. and makes it *Tyranny*, *French Dragooning*, *Massacring*, and what not.

Pag. 116. he says, *It does not appear that any Protestant in Ireland, before this Disarming, had us'd his Arms to injure any Rom. Catholick, nor did they hurt any that were not actually robbing or assaulting them; no, not in the North, where they refus'd to give up their Arms, &c.* You have heard what the *Protestants* did before the First Disarming, 24. Feb. 1688. But the Second, 20. Jul. 1689. was in the Heat of the War betwixt K. James and the *Northern Associators*. *Kirk* was arriv'd, Lieutenant General *Mac-karty* defeated and taken at *Eneskillen*, *Derry* reliev'd about that time; and a Month after, *Schomberg* landed with the whole *English Army*: And yet our Author is very sure, that no *Protestant in Ireland, before this Disarming, nor not in the North, had oppos'd K. James; so that there was no reason or colour to disarm them.* This Author knows very well, that long before this the People of *Derry* took out their Pardon, for shutting their Gates against the E. of *Antrim's* Regiment; which was a Confession of some sort of Guilt. Thus much for what he asserts, n. 9. p. 105. viz. That there was no Provocation given by the *Protestants* in the North, for the Lord Deputy to send down an Army against them, in *March*, 1688.

All this concerns the North, where this Author then was not; but to shew that the *Protestants* in *Dublin* (where our Author was) were not idle, he tells, p. 97. and 98. of a Plot they had to seize the Lord Deputy himself, with the Castle and Stores; which he demonstrates to have been very feasible, and shews regret at the Loyalty of those that caus'd the Disappointment. This Plot was long before K. J. deserted *England*, as he tells us; it was when he sent Commissioners to treat with P. O. But under favour, our Author should not have divulg'd this Secret, for it justifies the Suspicion the Government had of the *Protestants*, from the Beginning. But our Author is very apt to forget and contradict himself; for in p. 98. just after his telling of this Plot of the *Protestants*, he says, *The Truth is, it was an unanimous Resolution of all the Protestants in the Kingdom, that they would not be the Aggressors; and they held fast to this Resolution.* Thus Plotting, with our Author, is no *Aggression*; and *Robbing, Plundering, and Murdering, &c.* are no Violation of *Allegiance and Laws.* Who would not think him in earnest, p. 226. where telling of *Julian the Apostate's* putting off the *Christians* Petitions for Justice, by telling them *their Master* advis'd them to be patient, and pronounced them blessed when persecuted. And we, says our Author, did exactly follow his Advice, tho' given in Raillery, and did not make the lest Step to right our selves by Force, till God's Providence appear'd signally for these Kingdoms, in raising them up a Deliverer, and putting the Crown on Their Majesties Heads. Our Author surely thinks his Readers to be as forgetful as himself, or else he would not so ridiculously and barefacedly contradict himself. He says, p. 106. That *My Lord Tyrconnel* hastened to make the Parties irreconcilable, by engaging them in Blood, and by letting loose the Army to Spoil and Plunder. But this is like the rest of his Assertions; for I have already shewn,

and

and it is to be seen more at large in several Narratives, that My Lord *Tyrconnel* stood in fear of the *North*, instead of provoking them. And as to *letting loose the Army to Spoil and Plunder*, notwithstanding the Provocations abovesaid, they treated the *Protestants* in the *North* with more Humanity, than their *Fellow-Protestants* us'd them, when *Schomberg* went over, who committed ten times more Devastations and Barbarities upon the *Protestants*, in a Month, than the *Irish* did from *March* to *August*; when all the *North*, except *Derry* and *Eneskillen*, were absolutely in their power. This Dr. *Gorge*, at that time Secretary to General *Schomberg* (and who must be suppos'd to know Affairs at that time) makes manifestly clear in his Letter to Col. *Hamilton*; wherein he exceedingly commends the good Discipline and Government of that Army, above that of *K. W's* Army.

Our Author says, p. 106. That the War was wholly imputable to My Lord *Tyrconnel*, who would not defer sending the Army into the *North*, till the King should come, who was then expected. But if he will hear Reason, I must tell him that the Lord *Tyrconnel* was too slow, to suffer the *Protestants* in the *North* to arm, list, associate, and even assault the King's Forts and Garrisons, disarm and kill his Soldiers, and at last publicly renounce the King, and proclaim another. And all this was a doing and visibly carrying on, from *September* to *March*, which in Politicks was too long to suffer it to run. And truly our Author deservedly laughs at My Lord *Tyrconnel's* Neglect or Ignorance, in leaving that Garrison without a Soldier in it. p. 103. Tho' he ought not to have called him *Bloody minded*; for if he had been so, he might in justice have dealt with them as Rebels deserve.

Mr. *Boyle's* Narrative, p. 13. says, That My Lord *Tyrconnel* deferr'd the sending down his Army Twenty Days after it had been resolv'd on in Coun-

cil. And being ask'd by a Gentleman, why he would suffer the Northern Rabble to affront the Government? He answer'd, He was unwilling to ingage in Blood, hoping they would of themselves reflect, and come to a better Temper. But since General *Seavington* had made the first Rupture by killing some of the Soldiers at *Tuam*, he would send with Expedition to quash the Rebellion. And yet the Army went not to the *North*, till the 11th or 12th of *March*.

But this Author says, c. 3. f. 8. n. 10. that if he had delayed a little longer till *K. James* himself had appeared amongst them, and offered them Terms, they would have complied with him; at least so far as to submit quietly to his Government. Our Author is the first Protestant of Ireland, that ever I found of that Opinion. And the Event prov'd it; for after they had been beaten at *Drumore*, *Colerain*, *Clady*, and were driven into *Derry* and *Eneskillen*, when *K. James* offered them what Terms they pleas'd, they refused them, and value themselves upon that and holding out. But how does this agree with the Character our Author gives of *K. James* in this Book? Wherein he represents him as a faithless, merciless, bigotted Tyrant, who designed to destroy all the Protestants, &c. I could refer our Author to a handsomer Character of *K. James*, and yet as mischievous as our Author's. And that is what the *E. of Danby* gave of him to the *Yorkshire* Gentlemen, viz. "That
 " no Nation in the World would be happier in a
 " King, if he were but rescued from the Evil
 " Council of the Priests and Jesuits, &c. And even his very Enemies must own him to be a very courteous good natur'd Man. And they that charge him with Miscarriages impute them to his Zeal for Religion: A very singular Fault in these times! And as to his Carriage in Ireland, it's well known, that he opposed the Bill of Attainder, and the Act for Repeal of the Acts
 of

of Settlement, encouraging the Protestant Lords to speak against it in Parliament. He complain'd to the E. of Granard, *That he was fallen into the hands of a People, who ram'd many hard things down his Throat.* And being told by that Lord of the driving of the Protestants before the Walls of Derry, the King told him he was sorry for it; and that he had sent immediate Orders to discharge it; and that none but a barbarous *Muscovite* (so he stiled General *Rosen*) could have thought of so cruel a Contrivance. It's very rude, as well as unjust in our Author to asperse K. James with so great a Falshy, as that he *shou'd be the first that mention'd the Repealing the Acts of Settlement, in his Speech at the opening of the Parliament at Dublin.* I have seen that Speech, and there is no mention of the *Repeal*, or any thing like it, but rather the contrary, for he says, he did not desire a *Repeal* of the Acts of Settlement, but only a *Relief* to such as had been injured by those Acts, which may happen in the justest Acts in the World. I will give you the Words and let our Author blush if he can. I am sure he ought. “ I shall also most
 “ readily consent to the making such good and
 “ wholesome Laws, as may be for the general Good
 “ of the Nation, the Improvment of Trade, and
 “ the relieving such as have been injur'd by the
 “ late Acts of Settlement, as far forth as may be
 “ consistent with Reason, Justice, and the Publick
 “ Good of my People. I doubt the two Words, *Reason* and *Justice*, both which our Author hath highly offended, deterr'd him from putting this Speech into his Appendix, which would have made a better Figure there, than many things of greater Bulk and less Consequence, which he hath stuffed into it.

To insinuate an Untruth any way takes off from the Character of any Man; but to insert an Untruth, and enforce it with the Face of an Authentick

tick Voucher is Impudence to the highest Degree and yet our Author, good Man, just as before, here again quotes my Lord *Sunderland's* Letter of 23 of *March* 1689. to confirm his aspersing the King with proposing the Repeal of the *Acts of Settlement*, and that Ch. Justice *Nugent* and Baron *Rice* succeeded in their Design, when they came over in the Spring, 1688. to concert *Methods of Repealing the Acts of Settlement*; whereas the foresaid Letter of my Lord *Sunderland*, which our Author cites, says positively in these Words, *that the King was resolv'd not to think of it that Year, and perhaps never.* In short, after several Conferences K. *James* had with some Members of the House of Commons, and with a Committee of that House, in Presence of the Lord chief Justice *Nugent*, Baron *Rice*, Judge *Daily*, and Attorney General *Neagle*, &c. he plainly laid before them the unreasonableness of their Proceedings: That it was not proper to enter upon so great a Matter as the destroying the said Acts, in time of War, when all Parties could not be heard; and some of the Roman Catholick Judges declar'd not only to the King, but to the said Committee, and to several of both Houses of Parliament, and of the Privy Council, That it was unjust to break the Acts, and destroy the Purchasers, Widows, Orphans, Merchants, and all Traders, on pretence to relieve Widows and Orphans. 'Tis certain the King did encourage the Protestant Lords to oppose the Repeal of the *Acts of Settlement*, and it would be a Scandal to doubt but that those Lords meant it at the same time for the King's Service; which is further demonstrated from the loyal Zeal which carried the Bishop of *Meath* so far as to desire leave of the King, to attend upon his Majesty to the *Boyne*, to assist him against his Enemies. His Lordship was likewise one of those mention'd in the *Irish* Parliament's Address with K. *James's* Speech Printed with it.

it. In which “ they abhor the unnatural Usur-
 “ pation of *P. O.* and the Treason of those who
 “ joined with him in *England* and *Ireland*; and profess
 “ they will assert his Rights to his Crown with their
 “ Lives and Fortunes, against the said Usurper and
 “ his Adherents, and all other Rebels and Traytors
 “ whatsoever. These are the Words of the Ad-
 dress, which bears date 10 *May* 1688.

The King labour'd under too many Pressures at that time to deserve the additional Weight of this of passing the Acts of *Attainder*, and *Repeal of the Acts of Settlement*, when they saw him struggle with all his Might against it. Nay the *Irish* had so little Compassion, (not to name Loyalty) that they threatened to lay down their Arms and leave him, unless he would immediately pass these Acts, and yet they knew it was highly prejudicial to his Service. But they had the King in their Power, and to the best of their Understandings, were resolv'd to make their Advantage of it.

It is a melancholly Reflection to think of the many Insolencies of the *Irish* to that unhappy Prince; yet his own Innocence; his Tenderneſs of his Subjects, and his strict Regard to Justice, could weigh nothing with these *Irish Protestants*, at least with this Author, to have any milder Thoughts of K. J. or to confess to the World, what they very well knew to be true, viz. That K. James oppos'd the passing the Act of *Attainder*, and *Repeal of the Acts of Settlement* all he could. And yet our Author cannot help owning p. 150. That K. J. made use of them (the Protestant Bishops) to moderate by way of Counterpoise the Madness of his own Party. And yet at another time all the Madness of that Party must be thrown upon the King; who has deserv'd better Treatment from this Author, who owes the Life he now enjoys to King James's Mercy (as Bloody and Merciless as he has painted him) Was he not accus'd of holding
 Corre-

Correspondence, and giving *Intelligence* to the Rebels both in *England* and the *North of Ireland*? And was it not true? Did he not give frequent *Intelligence* to *Schomberg* by one *Sherman*, and keep constant Correspondence with Mr. *Tollet* and others in *London*? A bloody Minded Tyrant would have found another Remedy for such Treason, than a short Imprisonment! K. *James* had once so good an Opinion of this Author, that he had him frequently in private, and trusted him in his Affairs, till at last he found him out, but his old Friend the Lord chief Justice *Herbert* Skreen'd him, and continued him a little longer in the King's good Opinion.

About Sept. 1688. when the News of *P. O's* Landing was very hot, this Author did in his Letter mightily bemoan, that there was no Care taken to make some Proof of the Prince of *Wales's* Birth, to stop the Stories that were spread about against it. If, says he, something of this sort were done, to satisfy rational Men of the Birth of the Prince, I am confident the Church of *England* would once more (as in the Bill of Exclusion) venture to oppose the Current of the Nation, and stand by the Truth. Accordingly when this was done in Oct. 1688. by the Depositions then publish'd, we hear'd of no more Objections from this Author, and suppose he was satisfied, for till the Battle of the *Boyne*, this Author recogniz'd him Prince of *Wales* in his solemn Addresses to God in the Face of the People. Nay after that Battle this Author did complain to a Gentleman, that the Parliament in *England* had neither proved the Imposture of the Prince of *Wales*, nor the *French League*, and that it was imposing upon the Nation to think to make them swallow these things without Proof. And notwithstanding all this, in his Thanksgiving Sermon 16 Nov. 1690. for the Victory of the *Boyne*, &c. he speaks of that *League* with as much Assurance, as if he had transacted it himself

himself, and makes it the chief Head of his Declarations against K. *James*, and the great Reason for abdicating him. And of the Pr. of *Wales* he says in the same Sermon, p. 16. *That it was not so much as a well contrived Cheat.* And yet this Author, with the rest of the *Dublin* Clergy, pray'd daily for this *ill-contrived Cheat*, as Pr. of *Wales*, and for his Father too. Before the Association in the *North of Ireland*, they pray'd for K. *J.* The Beginning of *March* following, they proclaim'd P. O. King, and pray'd for him. When K. *James* broke the Forces at *Dramore* in the *North*, and reduc'd all but *Derry* and *Eneskillen*, they pray'd again for K. *J.* And in *August* following, when *Schomberg* arriv'd, as far as their Quarters reach'd they pray'd for K. *W.* Four times in one Year praying forwards and backwards. Good God! What Apprehension had these Men of their Publick Prayers; bantering God Almighty, and mocking Him to His Face, Who heard their Words and saw their Hearts! Is not Atheism a smaller Sin than this? Since it is better to have no God, than to set up One to laugh at. Who can forbear his Resentment of such vile Hypocrisy and Prevarication.

The most Charitable Thought for such Men must be, that they never consider'd, whether what they did, was a Fault or not: For in their Address of *Jun. 1690.* they tell K. *W.* *We do not doubt but God will hear the Prayers of his Church, and crown Your Majesty's Arms with Success*————— and assure him, that they would pray for him *with the most Hearty Importunity.* Not hypocritically, and against their own Heart, as they did for K. *J.* nor to that Degree that the Bishop of *Meath*, in his Speech at the Head, and in the Name of the *Dublin-Clergy*, *July 7. 1690.* takes pains to clear himself and them to K. *W.* from having been so much as Trimmers towards K. *J.* while he was there among them; and (it was but a Week after this *Bp.* offer'd his

Service to K. J. to attend upon him to the *Boyne*) and their praying for him was only Matter of Form to please him ; they meant not as they said.

But nothing of all this touches upon our Author ; he is still very confident, p. 238. *That they were not guilty of any servile or mean Compliances ; or, as the Bp. of Meath words it, of no Compliances, but such as were at once but innocent and necessary.* Soft and sweet ! But where is the *Innocence or Necessity* of Perjury, Dissimulation, and Treachery ? If to deceive Men was neither servile nor mean, was it both innocent and necessary to mock God ? Our Author says, the *Papists* loaded them with a Charge, viz. *That they had no Religion at all, that they only pretended to it, but were Atheists and Traytors in their Hearts.* Lay your Hands on your Hearts Gentlemen, and consider the Weight of this Charge. It is true indeed, they treated the King with all imaginable Demonstrations of Loyalty and Affection, but how sincere, let the World judge.

None in *Ireland* were so forward to address and compliment K. *James*, from the time of his landing at *Kinsale*, to his arrival at *Dublin*, as the Clergy. But this good Humour did not hold long ; they soon shook hands and parted with their Consciences, which were at the Service of the next Comer, or him that bid most. But of all the *Passive-Obedience-Champions*, none came up to our Author, even at the Beginning of this *Revolution* : He told a Person of Honour, from whose Mouth I have it ; “ That if P. “ O. came over for the Crown, and should accept “ it, he pray’d God might blast all his Designs. “ That there was no way to save the Honour of “ our Religion, but our steady Loyalty. That it “ would be a Glorious Sight to see a Cart full of “ Clergymen going to the Stake for *Passive Obedience*. That it would be the Glory and Support “ of our Religion, but that a Rebellion would ruin “ and

“ and disgrace it. He said, if there were no more
 “ than that *Declaration*, which he had subscrib’d, of
 “ *it’s not being lawful, upon any Pretence whatsoever, to*
 “ *take Arms against the King, &c.* He would dye a
 “ Thousand Deaths rather than do it.’ At a
 Meeting of the *Clergy of Dublin*, in 1688, he declar’d,
 That their taking Arms in the North of Ireland,
 was a Rank Rebellion, particularly Derry shutting their
 Gates against the King’s Forces, sent thither. And
 when it was urg’d, That Subjects might arm in defence
 of their Laws, &c. he violently oppos’d it,
 calling it *Rebellion*. In the Year 1686, or 1687, he
 wrote to a Person of undoubted Credit, giving an
 Account of his Discourse with several *Irish Bps.*
 whom he visited as he went from *Wexford Waters*;
 “ That if the King or our Temporal Governors
 “ should enact Unjust Laws, the Subject had no
 “ Remedy but Patience, against whom we allow no
 “ Arms but Prayers and Tears, and that it was un-
 “ lawful to call in a Foreign Force, or erect a New
 “ Government to redress Unjust Laws: And adds,
 “ That it is a sad thing that it is not observed, that
 “ *Rebellion* in the State and *Schisme* in the Church a-
 “ rise from this one Principle, viz. *That Subjects may*
 “ *in some Cases resist.* That it is intolerable for Mem-
 “ bers of any State to flee to *Forreign Succours* out
 “ of pretence, that their own Governours had made
 “ Laws against Reason, Conscience and Justice, and
 “ foolish to alledge in their defence, *That all Mankind*
 “ *is of one Blood, and bound to help one another.* And
 yet this last he has made his great argument in this
 Book, *ch. 1. Sec. 5.*

The same Person told me about the beginning of
 the Revolution he was in Company with the Author,
 and another Gentleman, who blamed the Preaching of
Passive-Obedience so high, as the cause of what had
 befallen us; when this Author smartly reprov’d and
 vindicated the Doctrine of *Passive-Obedience to the*
Height.

Height. But that Zeal and Courage has left him; and he shuns all that knew his former Principles, and have not changed them as he has done. He declined all the while he was in *London* in 1692, to see a deprived Bishop, with whom he had been as intimate as with any Man, and when he was minded of it to see his old Friend, he said, they should fall into Heats. In *October* 1692, being in *Oxford*, on his Road to *Ireland*, and he and Mr. *Hudson* of *University College* walking in the School Quadrangle, Mr. *Dodwell* his admired Acquaintance was going up to the Library, and Mr. *Hudson* asking him whether he should call after him, our Author forbid him, saying, he, Mr. *Dodwell* would be angry with him. If he thought Mr. *Dodwell* in an Error, he ought to have endeavour'd to convince him. But he knew Mr. *Dodwell* stood upon the same Ground where he left him, and that it was himself that had prevaricated and forsaken his first Love, and therefore was ashamed to see the Man, who knew his Principles so well before, and who had stuck close to them in the Day of Tryal. Tho' hardned against a Blush, the very sight of such a Man is upbraiding his Cowardice and Inconstancy, and he therefore shun'd his sight, as guilty Sinners would the Face of Heaven.

But our Author has gotten a new Language as well as new Principles, p. 182. (it should be 190.) he says, *K. James* was ungrateful to the *Irish Protestant-Clergy*: This is somewhat familiar: But what was the King's Ingratitude? Because if they had been disloyal in *Monmouth's* or *Argile's* Rebellion, they might have made an Insurrection, &c. So that this Author thinks the King was in their Debt for not *Rebelling*. And to enhance the value of them a little more, he says, by their Zeal for *K. James* they lost the Affections of the People. This is a Scandal upon them, and I dare say for them, that the People took no more Offence at the Clergy's Zeal for the King, then they did

did at that Letter our Author wrote to the Lord Bishop of *Kilmore*, upon his loyal Sermon Preach'd in 1684. in which he positively avers, That it is impossible for any of our Communion to be disloyal without renouncing his Religion.

This past better with the *Irish Protestants*, than that Super-Loyal Strain of our famous Dr. *Tillotson* (in his Sermon Preach'd before the King at *White-hall*, April 2. 1680. upon *Josh. 24. 15.*) did with the *Church of England Men* here. The Passage is p. 11. sect. 2. of the Sermon; where the Doctor, in profound Adoration of the Royal Authority, and the Legal Establishment of a Nation, makes it unlawful to Preach against the establish'd Religion of a Nation (tho' it be false) unless we could justify our Commission by *Miracles* as the Apostles did. " All, says he, that
 " Persons of a different Religion can in such a Case
 " reasonably pretend to, is to enjoy the private Liberty and Exercise of their own Conscience and
 " Religion; for which they ought to be very thankful, and to forbear the open making of Proselytes
 " to their own Religion (tho' they be never so sure that they are in the right) till they have an
 " extraordinary Commission from God to that Purpose.

This indeed does effectually secure the People from being disturb'd with the hearing of the *Christian*, or any other Religion, but that wherein they were bred, till a new Age of *Miracles* shall arise.

If our Author had gone this length of Passive Obedience, I should not wonder that some *Irish Protestants* had been offended; for it did not relish with us here, tho' the good Doctor was at the pains to print it twice for our Information. And that he had two Years before instructed the Honourable *House of Commons* in the same flight of Loyal Principles, in his Sermon preach'd before them 5. Nov. 1678. upon *Luk. 9. 55, 56.* where p. 17. After a Severe Invektive against Rebellion, Deposing and Killing Kings,
 and

and betraying our Country into the Hand of *Forreigners*, &c. he says, “ Let any Man say worſe of Atheiſm and Infidelity if he can. And for God’s ſake, “ *What is Religion good for*, but to reform the Manners and Diſpoſitions of Men, to reſtrain humane Nature from Falſhood and Treachery, from “ Sedition and Rebellion !

The Chriſtian Religion indeed is the moſt conducive of any thing to promote *Temporal* Peace, and good Government ; but it has much more Spiritual and greater Ends than theſe ; viz. Eternal happineſs, the clear viſion of God, and Enjoyment of him for ever. And therefore it is good for ſomething beſides *Temporal* Quiet, which it does not always procure ; nor is it always a *Bleſſing*, unleſs attended with Truth ; but Peace and Security in our *Sins* is the greateſt Curſe : And therefore a Religion that diſturbſ the outward Peace of this World, may not be *Worſe than Atheiſm or Infidelity*, as the Dr. ſuppoſes ; for they lead to *Hell and Damnation*. And that I humbly conceive, is worſe than any Imbroilments in this World, that were ever cauſ’d for Religion. But the Dr. goes on in the ſame Sermon on the 5. of *Nov.* and ſays, “ Better it were there were “ no Revealed Religion, and that humane Nature “ were left to the Condu&t of it’s own Principles “ and Inclinations—— than to be acted by a Religion that —— is continually Supplanting Government &c. And p. 21. The Do&trine of depoſing and “ ſubverting Government is as bad, or worſe than “ Infidelity, and no Religion. But bleſſed be God, “ ſays *Pious* Dr. *Burnet*, in his Sermon on *Rom.* 13. “ v. 5. p. 36. Our Church hates and condemns this “ Do&trine, and hath eſtabliſh’d the Right and Authority of Princes on ſure and unalterable Foundations, enjoyning Obedience to all the Lawful “ Commands of Authority, and an abſolute Submiſſion to the Supream Power, which God “ hath

“ hath put in our Sovereign’s Hands. This we just-
 “ ly Glory in; and if any have turned *Renegadoes*
 “ from this — their *Apostacy* leaves no blame on
 “ our Church.” This is plain dealing; and, no doubt;
 express’d with a Godly Zeal; as was that Pious eja-
 culation of our Author, c. 2. s. 7. n. 2. p. 29. *That he is*
a very dishonest Man, that dissembles or alters his opini-
on, without any other visible motive besides Gain or Pre-
ferment &c. And p. 31. The Truth is, they were People
that made no distinction between right and wrong, but as they
serv’d their Interest.

Good Men and True! But would it be thought
 Malicious to retort these Words upon them for their
 desertion of these Principles of *Loyalty* and *Passive O-*
bedience? There’s room for a severe Reprehensi-
 on; but we’ll let them alone for the present; and
 only observe of our Author and the rest of his Bre-
 thren, the *Dublin-Clergy*, that there never was so
 suddain and shameful a Turn in Men professing Re-
 ligion; and the manner of it so impolitick, as to
 make it evident they took the Oaths with at least a
Doubting and *Scrupulous* Conscience (the Sentence of
 which they may read Rom. 14. 23.) for they did
 not take them freely, but kept off, some to the last
 day, roaring against them all the while, and then
 coming about all at once, with new-coynd *Distin-*
ctions and *Declarations*, point blank contrary to the
 declared Sense of the Imposers. They differ’d a-
 mong themselves; every one had a particular *Salvo*
 for his own Conscience. It is a Severe Jest the
 Common People cast upon the Clergy, viz. *That no*
Parliament can make an Oath which the Clergy will refuse.
 In short, they have made use of such mean Arts to
Shift and Accommodate this Oath to their Interests,
 that K. W. had no reason to trust them.

I will not enter upon the Case of the Deprived
 Clergy, only say this, that their Firmness to Passive
 Obedience has kept many Men from Rank Atheism,
 and

and believing all Religion to be really a mere Cheat. For when Men find so many of them part with all they have in the World, Honours, Estates, and ready to lay down their Lives for those Principles they Preach'd, it forces People to reflect that those Men are in earnest with their Religion, and that there may be such a thing in the World. For the greatest danger to which we are now expos'd by the Defection of the Clergy, is not only *Popery* or *Phanaticism*, whose Principles they have embrac'd, but a contempt of all Religion. God avert this sad O men! It's an unpleasing Object, to behold the Nakedness and Reproach of so many once Renowned Members of the Church of *England*!

Among these Melancholy Discoveries we have made of the Failings of our *Friends*, let us not forget those of our opposites of the Church of *Rome*, least they glory in our downfall,

I shall not meddle with the Confederacy of Pope *Innocent XI.* the Emperour, K. of *Spain* and other *Roman Catholick Princes*, to set up a *Protestant* Prince against a *Roman Catholick* King, to whose Charge our Author lays nothing more than what he calls the natural Effects of *Popery*: And for this Thousands of Armed Papists came to dispossess him.

I mean not to make any National Reflections, I shall only instance in those *Irish Roman Catholicks*, who gave Cause to make the World believe that they acted more out of Interest than pure Principles of Loyalty. Witness their forcing King *James* to call a Parliament so unseasonably; their threatening to lay down their Arms and desert him, if he would not pass the Bill of Attainder, and repeal the Acts of Settlement; their hindering him so many times from going to *Scotland*, which then was visibly his Interest, suffering none they could hinder, *English* or *Scots*, tho' *Roman Catholicks* to be employ'd, and even forcing some of his Ministers from him, whom
they

they thought not in their Interest. Which made the King complain to a *Scots Gentleman* pressing him to mind his Affairs in Scotland. *What can I do? You see I am left alone, I have none to do any thing for me.* But above all, some moving to him for leave to cut off the *Protestants*, he answer'd them with Indignation, saying, *What Gentlemen are you for another Forty-One?* This so gaul'd them, that they ever after look'd on him with a jealous Eye, and tho' they knew him to be a *Roman Catholick*, thought him too inclinable to the *Protestants*. Lastly their *Surrender*, or *Selling of Limerick*, when they were able to have held out till the *French Succours* could have come. Some of those *Irish* have been rewarded by K. W. and made no Scruple to swear to K. W. and Q. M. which was after generally done by Direction of their Clergy. It was not much better they serv'd his *Father*; first calumniating him for pretended Kindnesses to them and their Religion, counterfeited Commissions under his Name (which Sr. *Phelm O Neal* confess'd at his Death) and endeavour'd to cast the Odium of their Rebellion and Massacre upon him, &c.

Nor have the *English Catholicks* any reason to insult, for in their publick Chappels they pray'd for K. W. and Q. M. and all the *Protestant-Nonjurors* say, there is the same Argument against *Praying as Swearing*; and of all their Number none allow'd himself to *Pray* but Dr. *Sherlock* alone, who, as he tells in the Preface of his *Recantation*, stood single among the *Non-jurors*. But the same Principle that led him to *Pray* brought him to *Swear*. And this in time they came to, being Authoris'd so to do from *Rome*, the Dispensation for it being common to be seen.

Upon the whole, none but the *Non-jurors* of the Church of *England* have adher'd to the Principles they profess'd; which shews their inflexible Loyalty,

alty, whom nothing can move from their Duty. But to do Justice to all, we cannot forget the Rise and Source of our Disease, whence all these Evils we do now and may feel have come upon us; and that is our wicked *Presbyterian* Rebellion against K. Charles I. which banish'd his Children into Popish Countries, permitting one of them to suck in the Principles of the *Roman Catholick* Religion, of which those Hypocrites accus'd his Father, and on that Pretence, instigated his deluded Subjects to Rebel against him. Therefore it is plain, that we are to thank the *Presbyterians* for K. J's being a *Roman Catholick*, and all the ill Consequences of it.

God often in his All-wise Providence suffers Rebellion to bring on those same Evils, for prevention of which we chose to Rebel. As the *Jews* Crucified Christ, lest the *Romans* should come; *Joh. 11. 4. 8.* and his Death brought the *Romans*, who did take away their Place and Nation. This had been an Application more befitting a Divine, and to have warn'd us of those Sins, which have provok'd God to send his Judgments amongst us, rather than to bite the Stone, not minding the Hand that threw it; to lay all upon K. J. if it had been true, had not been altogether so mannerly; but to tell downright Untruths of him, or to mis-represent the Truth, is directly *Diabolical*, the Office of the *Adversary* and false *Accuser*. Instead of aspersing others he had done well to clear himself and others of his Completion from the Imputation of *Deposing Kings*, *Dispensing with Oaths*, *Jesuitical Equivocations*, and *mental Reservations*, not keeping Faith with Hereticks, and several other things formerly rail'd at as Popery. Thus have they suck'd the very Dregs of Popery; and yet all this must be allow'd for the Good of the Church. But if to preserve the Protestant Religion will excuse us to dispense with God's Command, we shall soon grow more odious than *Popery* or the *Jewish*

Jewish Doctrine of Corban, which dispenses with the fifth Commandment upon the same Pretences, viz. for the Good of the Church to enrich the Treasury of the Temple; or the *Phanatick* Confession of Faith, *That Dominion is founded in Grace*. All these have the Advantage of our *Church of England Clergy*. The *Jews* had the *Tradition of their Elders* to plead; the Church of *Rome* have their *Great Council of Lateran* for the deposing Doctrine; the Council of *Constance* for violating Faith with Hereticks, &c. And the *Presbyterians* have their *Solemn League and Covenant*. But the *Church of England Clergy* are destitute of all these Helps. There is nothing but the direct contrary in all her Articles, Homilies, Canons, or any Constitutions of their Church. These they have adher'd to, and the *Metropolitan of all England* with a *Quorum of Bishops*, and several hundreds of the *Inferior Clergy*, suffer'd themselves to be depriv'd, rather than act or teach the contrary. Therefore this cannot be called a *Defection* of the *Church of England*, but of those Persons who have done it in Opposition to their Superiors in the Church, as well as in the State; and let them answer for it, but let the Reputation of the Church be preserv'd. This *K. James* himself vindicated; when being at *Dublin*, an *Irish Lord* began to reproach the *Church of England* for her *Apostacy* from her former Principles of Loyalty, &c. The King reply'd, *They are the Church of England, who have kept to the Principles of the Church of England*. The Lord made answer, *But Sir how few are they in comparison with the rest?* The King said, *They are more than Christ had to begin Christianity with*.

All rightful Kings of *England* are secure in the Members of the *Church of England*; but when *Papists* or *Presbyterians* take Arms for the Propagation of Religion they act according to their Principles. But a true *Church of England Man* cannot take Arms
 against

against his King on any pretence whatever, without renouncing the Principles of his Church, or in Dr. Burner's Words turning *Renegado* and *Apostate*. But tho' God has sifted her, and discover'd her unsound Members, yet we may perceive by the Remnant he has left, that it will end in rendring her more Pure and Glorious, after she has past the Refiners Fire. But we will return to our Author.

Amongst the rest of our Author's Failings, he is very apt to set down things at *Random*, merely for want of Pains to examine them. c. 3. f. 12. at the End p. 165. He pretends to compute what the Estates of all the *Jacobites* in *England* and *Scotland* are worth. And p. 61. he accuses the Judges, particularly the Lord chief Justice *Nugent* of down-right Bribery, *That he went Sharer in Causes before him, and not only appeared for them on the Bench, but also secretly encouraged and fomented them.* Now the very Enemies of that Judge have affirm'd this to be a rank Slander, and our Author without Proof ought not to have exhibited in Print an Accusation of so heinous a Nature. This *Nugent*, says our Author, *was pitch'd upon by K. J. to judge whether the Outlawries against his Father and his Fellow-Rebels should be reversed.* Whereas it is certain, That his Father the Earl of *Westmeath* was never Outlawed. p. 60. n. 3. He calls *Felix O Neil* (a Master of Chancery in K. J's time) Son of *Furlogh O Neil* the Great Rebel in 41. And that *Furlogh O Neil* was Brother to the famous Sir *Phelm O Neil*, and was not Father to this *Felix O Neil*. But it is most certain that this *Felix O Neil's* Father's Name was *Phelm*, and that he was so far from being a *Massacrer* in 41. that he was civil to the Protestants in those times, particularly to — *Guilliam*, Father to *Meredith Guilliam*, afterwards a Major in K. W's Army, whom he oblig'd by his civil Usage of him, when he was Prisoner

ner with the *Irish*, and the same *Guilliam's* Relations do still acknowledge it.

Our Author has another Excellency, and that is, of making things pass by *Innuendoes*, whose falshood would have detected them, had they been told plainly. For Example, p. 144. Speaking of the Assurances sent over by K. J. to *Ireland* by the Earl of *Clarendon* Lord Lieutenant, and Sir *Charles Porter* Lord Chancellor, he says, " These Declarations gain'd belief from the credulous Protestants; especially, that made by Sir *Charles*, who behaving himself with great Courage and Integrity in his Office, went a great way to persuade them." Plainly hinting as if My Lord *Clarendon* had not behaved himself with that Courage and Integrity he ought to have done. He is the first *Irish Protestant* I ever heard give that Lord an ill Word, as to his Government in *Ireland*.

I will suppose none will deny but K. *Char. II.* at his Restauration had thereby a good Title to *Ireland*. But our Author says, *The Conquerors* (viz. *Oliver's Army*) joined in bringing home K. *Char. II.* and generously gave up themselves, together with the Kingdom of *Ireland*, without Articles or Conditions into his Hands. That is to say, They had a Right to have kept him out, and not to have admitted him without such Articles and Conditions as they thought fit. Truly, at this rate, and by such *Innuendos* Kings now are upon their good Behaviour ! As this Author Loyally expressed it on the 13th Jan. in *Christ Church, Dublin*, applying it to that Day, to shew the glorious Change of his Principles.

But for a noble Stroke, both for speaking at Random, for *Innuendos*, and Weight of Argument, see Ch. 3. S. 12. n. 21. p. 165. It is thus Stiled in the Heads of Discourse; *Protestants lost more in Ireland, than all that favour K. J's Cause in England are worth.* In the Section it self he adds *Scotland* too.

This is a Discovery the Parliament would thank him for ; and I wonder how he came to know more than they. But he goes on and *Innuendoes* in the *Jacobites Thoughts* too, as well as their Estates. *And I suppose*, says he, *it would put them* (the Jacobites) *out of Conceit with him* (K. J.) *or any other King* (there he brings in K. W.) *that should take but one Half of their Estates from them.* Here the Government has a Taste of his Obedience. But surely our Author never yet heard of the Deprivation of the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, and other English Bishops and Clergy, with a greater Number in *Scotland*, who have lost the Whole of their Estates, and it's believed would have laid down their lives too for what they thought their King ; and there were many Lay-non-jurors as resolute as they ; did he never hear of Mr. *Ashton's* suffering Death, and would not own this to be a Fault ? And that the Bishops of *Chichester* and *Worcester* asserted it upon their Death-Beds, and would rather have gone to the Stake than have forsaken their *Passive Obedience*, or taken the present Oaths. But these things are more tolerable than our Authors *Incredible Stories*. Such is that which he gives, c. 2. S. 8. n. 4. p. 33. Where he says, It seem'd an unreasonable Hardship to such of them as were Landlords, *That they should be called to an Account for Killing or Robbing their Tenants, or Ravishing their Daughters.* This was shocking from an Author of his Gravity, and put me upon the Curiosity of Enquiring of some Gentlemen of that Country, who told me, it was just as true as their *having Hair on their Teeth*.

It is almost as strange, what he tells, c. 3. s. 11. n. 8 p. 138. " That Col. *Luttrell*, Governor of " *Dublin* condemned Mr. *Piercy* a Merchant to be " Hanged, for saying (very calmly) *That he was not* " *willing to part with his Goods, if he could help it.* And as strange, that Mr. *Piercy* should escape, be-
cause

cause the Governor could not find any of the *Provoes*, Hangmen have not been scarce in *Ireland*; *Gaffney* for that!

In the Story of Mr. *Bell*, our Author is very partial and insincere; for he says, That *Bell* was confined to close Prison, and no Body allowed to speak to him—without any Crime so much as alledged against him. This Story carries Suspicion in the very Face of it. The Truth of it is this. This *Bell* by Passports and Safe-guards granted him by K. J. got a considerable Fortune in a short Time; some say 10000 *l.* whilst K. J. was in *Ireland*. In acknowledgment of which Favour, in Sept. 1690, after K. W. had risen from before *Limerick*, he gave an Entertainment to Mr. *Talbot*, and others of K. J's Officers at the *Duke's Head* in *Damar-Street* in *Dublin*; from some of whom I had this Account. And yet our Author says, *ibid.* K. J. would not suffer the Protestants to Trade. But he might, if he had pleased, told us the true Reason of *Bell's* Imprisonment, for he could not but know it. This *Bell* being thus encouraged by K. J. made use of it to betray him. In order to which he propos'd to his Majesty a Method of Corresponding with *Scotland*, which was, to grant *Bell* a Licence to send a Ship with Goods thither; and he would convey any Messenger safely his Majesty would send, and had contrived a private Place in his Ship for Papers, &c. in case of a Search. The King confiding in *Bell*, sent one Mr. *Strauchan* in his Ship with Dispatches to several of his Friends: But *Bell* wrote before to his Correspondent in *Glasgow*, to whom the Goods were consign'd, acquainting him with *Strauchan's* coming from K. J. and in what part of the Ship the Papers were laid, and desir'd him to send this Account to the Council, which he did, and sent it in *Bell's* Letter, which was read publickly at the Council-Board; upon which *Strauchan*

was apprehended, and all his Papers seiz'd, and the Persons to whom they were address'd were committed; as the Countess of Errol, &c. And it was upon Advice of this Treachery, that *Bell* was committed; which deserved a severer Treatment.

Our Author, in his usual Stile of Sincerity, tells another Story, c. 3. f. 1. n. 6. That *Sir Charles Murray* was Clapt up a Prisoner by *K. J.* in the Fort of *Kingsale*, because he professed himself a Protestant, not knowing any other Reason for his Confinement. But not only *Sir Charles* (who was afterwards in the King's Service) but almost every Body there knew, that it was for his (*Sir Charles's*) speaking disrespectful and reflecting Things of the *French King* on board the *French Admiral*, and that at the Complaint of *Count D' Avaux* the *French Ambassador* he was confin'd.

But none of these Stories are so incredible as that Plot p. 139. to Starve one Half of the Protestants, and Hang the other. Which our Author says, Was really attempted, by refusing to sell the Protestants Bread, and taking what they had from them: Whereas *Dr. Gorge* Secretary to General *Schomberg* in his Letter to *Col James Hamilton*, in April or May 1690, tells of the great Care and Kindness *K. J.* shewed to the Protestants, particularly in *Dublin*, and that among other Instances of Justice done the Protestants, Two Irish Soldiers were Hanged before a Protestant Baker's Door for stealing Two Loves not worth a Shilling. As unlikely was it, that they design'd to Hang the other Half, whereas they did not all the Summer 1689. Hang one, tho' some of them deserv'd it by Law, as this Author and *Mr. Bell* can witness.

As to the Affair of Corporations, our Author says, c. 3. f. 5. n. 2. p. 79. There was not one Corporation (in Ireland) found to have forfeited by a Legal Tryal; and that all the Corporations in the Kingdom were dissolved

Solved without the least Reason or Pretence of Abuse of Privilege or Forfeiture. I do not question, but there may be many Abuses in the manner of bringing *Quo Warrantos*: But the best of Lawyers will tell us, That few Charters of Corporations can stand against a *Quo Warranto*, if thoroughly examined.

But among all our Author's incredible Relations his Contradictions most exceed. The first Example of which shall be in his rude Treating of K. James's Person, c. 2. s. 2. n. 1. p. 15. he flatly gives him the Lye, for he says, *The Representation made by him was no less False, than his Promises were Unincere.* And c. 3. s. 18. n. 6. p. 211. *That the whole was a Piece of Deceit, a mere Collusion* — But this was the Justice we look't for, and constantly met with from him. This was mannerly to God's Anointed! There are many Instances of this kind, too Scandalous to repeat. But you shall see his Passion transporting him even to a Contradiction. c. 4 n. 1. p. 225. "He owns K. J's natural Compassion and merciful Disposition, c. 3. s. 1. n. 8. p. 49. He tells you of his Good Nature, his Natural Clemency; and perhaps, says he, *If he alone had been to have had the disposal of them (our Lives and Liberties) and would have followed his own natural Inclinations, we should not so much have feared to have trusted him; but whilst he had such Ministers about him, &c.*" Here the Fault was in his Ministers, who would not suffer the King to follow his natural Inclinations and Clemency. But c. 3. s. 12. n. 15. he says, "When it was left to K. J. entirely, what hopes could any Protestant have? And c. 3. s. 13 p. 169. he says, "They (the Protestants) knew, that if the King did not interpose, neither Juries nor Witnesses would be wanting to destroy them. Now the Protestants Security is in the King to save them from the Irish. And c. 3. s. 18. n. 11. this Author shews, How K. J. appear'd most zealously for the Pro-

F 4

"testants,

c. testants, and turn'd out the Mayor of *Wexford*,
 c. for not Restoring the Church of *Wexford* to the
 c. Protestants, according to His Majesty's Order.
 c. And, c. 3. f. 13. n. 3. p. 168. he tells, How the
 c. King carefully examin'd and redrest the Deceit
 c. of the *Fryars*, and in great Anger said, For ought
 c. he saw, the Protestants were wrong'd, and mis-repre-
 c. sented to him. Yet in the same Page he makes K.
 c. J. a Monster of Cruelty. He says, The very
 c. *Irish* Judges, even *Nugent* himself, were for ac-
 c. quitting Mr. *Brown* for making his Escape from
 c. those who came to plunder him, and that after
 c. Judge *Nugent* had discoursed the King, he proceeded
 c. vigorously against the Gentleman, and procured him
 c. to be found Guilty, by a partial Jury, notwithstan-
 c. ding the Tears and Petitions of Mr. *Brown's*
 c. Wife, with Five or Six Children, begging her Husband's
 c. Life at his Feet, &c. Yet K. J. is represented
 c. Proof against all this, and to have *Brown* Hang'd.
 c. This, says our Author, awaken'd all the Protestants
 c. in Ireland, who suspected that Judge *Nugent* would
 c. act the same Part in Ireland, that Ch. Justice Je-
 c. fferies had done in England; and they knew that if
 c. the King did not interpose, neither Juries nor Witnesses
 c. would be wanting to destroy them. Here is a flat
 c. Contradiction. K. J. inclines the Judges to pack
 c. Juries; and yet was all the Security against the
 c. Judges packing Juries.

c. But as to Mr. *Brown's* Case, our Author says,
 c. his Crime was only for making his Escape from
 c. those who came to plunder him. This indeed, if
 c. true, was a hard Case! But the Truth of the
 c. Story is this, as the *Irish* Protestants tell it.
 c. The Associating Gentlemen of *Munster* had design'd
 c. to seize *Corke* and *Bandon* as Places of the greatest
 c. Strength and Consequence in that Province. They
 c. succeeded at *Bandon*, but fail'd at *Corke*; upon
 c. which Disappointment, Capt. *Hen. Boyle*, one of
 c. the

“ the Conspirators fortify’d his House, *Castle-Martyr*, and Major Gen. *Mac-Carty* (after Lord *Mount-Cassel*) besieged him there. Sir *Thomas Southwel* and several other Protestant Gentlemen in the County of *Limerick*, with what Force they could make, march’d to raise the Siege; and in their March seized on all the Papist’s Horses, and this Mr. *Brown*, who was one of them, took the Horses of *Neagle* the High Sheriff of *Corke*, and a Man was kill’d in the Fray. Sir *Tho. Southwel* and his Company hearing of the Surrender of *Castle-Martyr*, endeavour’d to make their way to *Sligo* to join my Lord *Kingston* and other *Associators* in *Connought*; but he and 200 of his Men were taken by a small Party of K. J’s Dragoons, and upon their Tryal were over-persuaded, says our Author, to plead Guilty, *tho’ they had not been guilty of any Overt Act that could be constru’d Treason*. If Associating, Arming, Plundering, Killing, and Fortifying against the King be not *Treason*, I know not what is. And our Author says in *Brown’s Case*, That this was only making his *Escape from those that came to plunder him.*” This is a very unfair Way of telling a Story, and will spoil our Author’s Credit.

But to go on with our Author’s Contradictions. c. 2. s. 8. n. 10. The Title is, *That K. J’s Desire to be Absolute induc’d him to change his Religion*. And yet c. 3. s. 1. n. 5. the Title is, *Zeal for his Religion made him act against his Interest, &c.* Now it is strange that a King should change the Principles of the Church of *England* for those of the Church of *Rome*, out of a Desire to be more *Absolute*. The Church of *Rome* (4 *Con. Lateran.*) gives Power to Popes to depose Kings, and they have shewn Examples of it: But the Church of *England*, when K. J. had forsaken her Communion, damn’d this Deposing Doctrine and the Practice of it, and valued themselves

themselves upon the Principle of *Non-resistance* to their King, upon any Pretence whatsoever, as their distinguishing Character.

C. 3. f. 12. n. 15. p. 153. He makes K. J. most Absolute in the Parliament of Ireland, *This Parliament profess'd it self a Slave to the King's Will, &c.* Yet p. 37. you have the *Irish dispute his Orders, and stand on the Laws, and not suffer him to dispense with their Act of Attainder, &c.* And yet p. 18. *They pish'd at the Laws as Trifles, &c.* and p. 82. *The Members of Parliament would not stick to Sacrifice the Liberties and Laws of the Kingdom to the King's Will.* p. 153. *They devolv'd the Power of making and repealing Laws on the King's Pleasure:* And abundance more of this sort, too tedious to repeat. But how does this agree with what our Author, c. 2. f. 8. n. 5. p. 67. tells us, viz. How the *Irish* oppos'd K. J.'s Arbitrary Proceedings to that degree, that *he is said to have fallen into such a violent Passion, that his Nose fell a Bleeding.* Would any one believe, that this K. J. who was so highly bent to be *Absolute and Arbitrary*, would be content to be a *Vassel to France*? And yet this Author asserts it so positively p. 45. as to say, that *it is manifest.*

Our Author very inauspiciously stumbles upon the Case of K. J.'s Protections, which makes him most conspicuously Guilty of Contradiction. He says, c. 3. f. 13. n. 3. p. 172. — *They were kill'd with K. J.'s Protections in their Pockets.* In this I appeal to Secretary Gorge's Letter, in which he gives a remarkable Instance of K. J.'s granting Protections to the Protestants, and making them good to them against the greatest Provocations: viz. Notwithstanding Dr. Gorge was Secretary to Gen. Schomberg then at the Head of an Army to drive him out of Ireland, yet K. J. protected and preserved his Wife and Family, and upon their Application to him, gave them a Pass to go to the Secretary to Schomberg's Army. And in the same Letter the Secretary

tary aggravates the Breach of Protections and want of Discipline in *Schomberg's* Army, and shews that K. J. not only threatned severe Penalties upon the Breach of his Proclamations and Protections, but duly executed them. By which Letter it is plain, That K. W's Army destroy'd the Country, but that K. J. protected it. As to the seizing of the Estates of the *Absentees*, upon Application made in their Behalf, and any tolerable Reason given for their not returning, there was not only no Advantage taken of their not coming in within the limited Time of the Proclamation, but they had Time *sine die* given them, come when they would, and their Goods, tho' Forfeited by Law, were by the King's Command deliver'd by the Sheriffs to such Friends of the *Absentees* as made Application for them: For, as Dr. Gorge in that Letter says, K. James considered the Protestants, who were in Arms against him, rather as *deluded Subjects*, than as *obstinate Rebels*. All the *Irish* Protestants, who staid in *Ireland* while K. J. was there, will attest the Truth of what I have said; and I appeal to *Thomas Pottinger Esq;* whether K. J. did not give repeated Protections for the Town of *Belfast* and the Country about; and whether they were not made good by him and his Officers? And likewise, whether he (*Mr. Pottinger*) did not obtain leave of K. James for the *Irish* Merchants of *Belfast* and thereabout that had fled to *Scotland*, to return, after the expiration of the Time limited by the Proclamation, without stinting them to any Day? And whether, tho' few of them did return till *Schomberg* landed, their Goods were not preserved? Nay even when K. James was obliged to remove from that Country, whether he did not order Gen. *Maxwell*, then Commanding in *Belfast*, to take care that none of their Goods should be plunder'd or burnt upon their leaving it? And whether these Commands were not punctually observ'd

serv'd, not only at *Belfast*, but in other Places? I likewise appeal to the same Mr. *Pottinger*, whether the several Protections were not given *Gratis*, without any Fees; and without so much as an Oath requir'd of them? King *James* had tried the Security of Oaths before.

Mr. *Pottinger* can likewise attest the Truth of what Dr. *Gorge* says in his Letter of K. *J*'s extraordinary kindness to the *English*, when any of their Ships put in to *Belfast* (some from *India*, who knew not of the War, others by Strefs of Weather, or other Causes) and were seiz'd by the *Irish*, that they were releas'd, and suffer'd to pursue their Voyage to *England*; and that the King gave general Orders to his Officers commanding on the Sea Coasts in the *North*, and other Places, that no *English* Ship should be disturb'd which came thither.

The *French* Fleet, which carried K. *J*. into *Ireland* took some *English* Merchantmen, while his Majesty was on Board, and when some of the Masters were brought before K. *James*, they fell on their Knees begging their Lives; which brought Tears into the King's Eyes, and he restor'd them their Ships and Effects, and order'd two Frigats to see them safe thro' the *French* Fleet.

Mr. *Pottinger* can tell how Lieutenant General *Hamilton*, when he march'd into *Lisburn*, was so far from Plundering, that he caus'd a Soldier to be shot, for taking a silver Spoon from one Mrs. *Ellis*, tho' she and several Protestants did beg his Life. *Belfast* was preserv'd from Plunder by the same Lieutenant General's Protection, at the representation of the foresaid Mr. *Pottinger*.

But when General *Schomberg* issued out Proclamations of Protection and Encouragement to the *Irish* to return to their Habitations, and some Countries became as full as before the Revolution; yet the *Protestant Army* fell upon them, and soon wasted the whole

whole Country : And when the *Irish* held out their *Protections*, they tore them and bid them wipe—— with them, and none were punish'd for this Breach. And asking the reason of this of some Officers, they told me, That where they had not Pay, they could not keep their Men under Discipline. I will not dispute the Validity of this Answer ; but the Matter of Fact is undeniable. Now if any one should lay all this, or the *Demitting* of the *Mac-donalds* of *Glencoe* in cold Blood on K. W. tho' done by exprefs Order from him, it would be construed an ill-grounded malicious Accusation.

Our Author, c. 3. f. 13. n. 4. p. 172. very unjustly charges K. J. in relation to the Protestants in the County of *Down*, who, says he, *had not only their Goods taken from them, but their Wives and Daughters were ravish'd by the Soldiers*. And the Protestants upon all this did only complain and demand Redress ; and the Answer they had was this. “ That these Robbers and Ravishers had no Authority from the King for what they did ; and “ therefore they advised the Complainants to fall “ upon them, if they made any further Attempts “ on the Country. The People did as they were “ directed, and accordingly fell upon the next Party of Soldiers they found Plundering and committing Outrages on the Country People, and “ killed some of them. This, instead of being approved, as they were made to believe, was “ counted a Rebellion ; and Major General *Buchan* “ was sent among them ; who Massacred about 5 or “ 600 of them in cold Blood, for several Days together. Many of those, who were kill'd, were “ poor, old impotent People, &c.

These are the Author's own Words. We will examine his Art and Integrity in this Story ; and I will set down nothing but what the Protestants in that Country know to be true. This then is the
Story

Story in brief. After the Defeat of the *Associat Forces* at *Drummore* 14. *Mar.* 1688. Lieutenant General *Hamilton* having granted his Protection to *Belfast* and other Places, and keeping his Soldiers under strict Discipline, as is said before; yet found the Country infested with *Irish Rapparees* or *Half Pike-Men*, as they call'd them, whom when his repeated Orders could not reclaim, and Soldiers were not in all Places at hand to defend the Country, the Lieutenant General for the greater Security of the Country, gave Orders to the People to sieze any such *Rapparees*, who had no Commission, and to commit them to the next *Goal*; and if they made Resistance, to kill them.

And this our Author mistakes (I fear, willfully) for a Liberty to fall upon the *Soldiers of the King's Army*. As if a General would not take the Punishment of those into his own Hands, but leave them to be knock'd o' the Head at the Discretion of the People.

This Author in his *Appendix* n. 25. sets down such an Order as this, given by the Marquis d' *Albaville* Jan. 2. 1689. and directed to the Commissioners of *Oyer and Terminer*, viz. " That you order all Men " to fall upon publick Robbers, who have no regard to their Duty towards God, their King or " Country — and consider them but as wild Beasts, " who live upon Prey and Rapine.

How justly our Author infers from such Orders as these a Liberty to the common People to fall upon the Soldiers, or any number of them they could Master, I leave to the Judgment of the Reader. But yet I have heard many Protestants of the County of *Down* and near it, say, That they have not heard of any Rapes upon the Protestant Women there, as this Author speaks, even by the *Rapparees*. But to go on with the Story.

There was one *Henry Hunter*, a Servant of Sir *George Atchison*, made a Captain by the *Associators*; who being taken Prisoner at the Defeat at *Drumore* made his Escape, and came into *Down*, where all had taken K. J's Protections and lived peaceably. There being but one Company quarter'd in the Barony of *Ardes*; *Hunter* comes thither, and getting a Rabble of poor People to follow him 15 Apr. 1689. he had a Scuffle with this Company, which he routed, and drove out of the Barony. Colonel *Mark Talbot* fearing this Rabble and the great Number of *Scots* there, durst not attack them. This Commotion gave great Disturbance to the Country People. Sir *Robert Maxwell* then living in the Castle of *Killileah* in the County of *Down* pretending to dread this Insurrection sent to Captain *Patrick Savage* (of the Lord *Iveagh's* Regiment) to come with his Company to *Killeleagh* for their Security in this Confusion; which he did, and seeing the Rabble under *Hunter* increase, he desir'd of Sir *Robert* that he might keep Guard in his Gate-House or Stables of the Castle, that he might not be surpriz'd. Sir *Robert* took two Days to consider of it, and in the mean time sent to *Hunter* to come thither, who did, and seiz'd Captain *Savage* and his Lieutenant in their Quarters, fell upon the Guard, kill'd three Men, and wounded six or seven. The Lord *Iveagh* demanded his Men, but *Hunter* prepares to attack him, and makes him retire into the mountainous part of the Country. Upon which *Hunter* entred *Down* in Triumph, and used those Protestants who would not join with him as ill as the *Irish*.

The Insurrection was now come to that Head, that it was fit for the Government to take Notice of it, accordingly Major General *Buchan* (whom this Author calls *Bohan*) is sent with a Force sufficient to deal with them. Being come in sight of them he sent a Trumpet, desiring to speak with their Leader

der or Chief, to offer him the King's Pardon, and prevent Blood-shed: But they fired upon the Trumpeter and refused all Parly. So they engag'd; *Hunter* was beaten and fled, and his Party dispers'd. And this is the Massacre that our Author says Major General *Buchan* made of 5 or 600 Men in cold Blood for several Days together. Which is false, for these reasons. For the Major General was very merciful on the Day of Battle; he stop'd Execution as soon as the Enemy were broke and out of Danger of rallying. And tho' several Shot were made at him from *Killileagh* Castle, yet upon the Reduction of it that same Night, he not only gave them their Lives, but sav'd them from Plunder. And tho' his Soldiers had march'd 16 Miles that Day, and fought in the Evening without any Refreshment, yet to prevent their plundring the Town he would not suffer them to enter it, but kept them without; as he did likewise at *New Town*, where he dismiss'd all the Prisoners, on no other Conditions than requiring an *Oath* from them, not to bear *Arms* again in opposition to *K. James*; which they took and broke, as our Author and others know who did. As the *Irish* pass'd over *Belfast* Bridge to their Quarters, their Officers stop'd them, and search'd them, to see if they had taken any Plunder in that Expedition, and what they found caus'd it to be deliver'd to *Mr. Pottinger*, then Sovereign of the Town, in order to be restor'd to the Owners. In short, there was not the least Disorder committed in their March back to *Carrickfergus*.

I could mention many Instances I have heard from Gentlemen and Ladies, who remain'd in *Ireland* while *K. James* was there, of the great Civility of the *Irish* Officers to them. I will instance in a remarkable One.

When

When the Rôut was at *Dromore*, and all were flying to the Sea as fast as they could, several Protestants fell into the Enemies Hands, at *Donaghadee*, a Sea-port in *Down*. Among these was Mrs. *Hawkins*, Wife to *John Hawkins Esq*; a zealous *Associator* in the *North*, and who had a Colonel's Commission from the P. O. (as all the rest had) before he was made King. He was among the first Associates, and made Secretary to the Association, and one of the *Ten* excepted in the Proclamation of *March 1688*. This Gentleman's Lady, notwithstanding her Husband's Provocations, instead of being plunder'd was civilly treated, and suffer'd to go off to Sea with all her Goods, Furniture, &c. and when she offer'd Major *Colagbon* her Coach as a Present, he refus'd it, and did not take the worth of a Penny from her. But to return to our Author's Massacre.

He could not have pitch'd upon a more improper Man to make a *Massacre* in cold Blood than Major General *Buchan*; For all that know that Gentleman know him to be a Soldier, and incapable of any such Brutality. The common Voice of all the *Irish* Protestants loudly proclaim'd how much they ow'd to the generous Civility of Lieutenant General *Hamilton*, Major General *Buchan*, and Major General *Maxwel*; tho' what they did was, as themselves own'd, by K. *James's* express Order. But he must have no thanks even by those Protestants, who extol his Officers for nothing but duly executing his Orders. The *Irish* were on the other Hand offended at these three *Scots* Generals for restraining them from using any Violence to the Protestants. And the Protestants did loudly curse *Hunter* for the Mischief he had brought upon them. I need not apply these Passages to that Representation this Author gives of them. The thing shews it self. Let the Reader judge whether these Protestants in the Coun-

ty of *Down* did only complain (as our Author avers) and whether they were Massacred in cold Blood, without Resistance, &c.

But our Author brings another heavy Charge against *K. James*, and that is breach of Articles to the Gentlemen in the Fort of *Culmore*, who were disarm'd and strip'd, &c.

I have spoken with some of those Gentlemen, who were in that Fort upon its Surrender, who say, that this is absolutely false, for the Articles were perform'd to a Tittle. I have often heard the *Irish* Protestants make honourable mention of *Sarsfield's* punctual Observation of his Articles, when he took *Sligo*, and several other Instances.

Now, on the contrary take a few Instances of the Perfidy of the other side. Major *Mac-sweeney* and other Officers of the Garrison of *Carrickfergus*, were kept Prisoners contrary to the Capitulation sign'd by *Mareschal Scomberg* himself.

The Sick and Wounded Officers and Soldiers in *Drogheda*, who upon it's Surrender were by the Capitulation to be taken care of and sent with Passes to their own Army, as they recovered their Health, were neglected, and might have starv'd, but for the Charity of some of their own Nation.

Upon the Surrender of *Corke*, the *Irish* Army were by the Conditions to be well used, and yet the General narrowly escap'd being murther'd by the Inhabitants, and the Garrison, after laying down their Arms, were strip'd, and march'd to a marshy Ground, where they were kept with Guards four or five Days, and forc'd to feed on dead Horses. And when remov'd, they were so crowded in Goals, Houses and Churches, that they could not all lye down at once, where thro' nastiness of dead Carcasses, Excrements and want of Food, they miserably perish'd. And the *Roman Catholick* Inhabitants tho'

tho' promis'd Protection, were plunder'd and strip'd and turn'd out of Town.

In *Decemb.* 1690. one Captain *Lowder* of Colonel *Hales's* Regiment being order'd to Guard 200 of the *Corke* Prisoners to *Clonmell*, as they fainted on the way thro' want, he shot 16 of them; and notwithstanding Major General *Dorrington's* complaint to General *Ginckle*, this *Lowder* had a Pardon and kept his Post.

After they were entire Masters of *Athlone*, in cold Blood they kill'd an hundred Men in the Castle, and a little Outwork on the River.

At *Aggrham* above 2000, who threw down their Arms and ask'd Quarter, after the *English* were Masters of the Field, and several who had Quarter given them, were kill'd in cold Blood. In which number were the Lord *Galway* and Colonel *Charles Moore*. And those that surviv'd found no Treatment like Prisoners of War, tho' General *Ginckle* had engag'd his Honour for it to Major General *Dorrington*, and own'd the good Usage their Prisoners had at *Limerick*, and other Places belonging to K. *James*. But what is more extraordinary, those general Officers, who were in the Tower, were metamorphiz'd from Prisoners of War to Prisoners of State, and committed for *High Treason*. General *Ginckle* own'd this was contrary to his Promise, and endeavour'd to do them what Service he could, but not with that Success he desir'd.

Add to this the sending many Hundreds of these poor *Irish* Prisoners at a time into *Lambay* (a Desert Island near *Dublin*) where their Allowance for four Days might be eaten at a Meal, and they thro' want perish'd miserably in heaps. In short, their Treatment of the poor *Irish* was such, as any one might be apt to imagine, they hardly thought them to be *Human Kind*.

Lastly, The *Irish* complain'd of Breach of publick Faith to those who submitted to the Government upon K. W's repeated Declarations, notwithstanding which, they were Outlaw'd and Prosecuted. And one who was in a considerable Post told me in these Words. " The Truth is, it was in the Power of their Gentlemen and Officers to make their Protections be observ'd; but that is not in our Power; for our Country Folks will not be restrain'd from falling upon the *Irish*. Dr. Gorge's Letter vouches this.

But let us now take a View of our Author's Politicks, p. 82. he says, *K. James purposely let the Ships of England decay and rot, that the French might grow great at Sea, and destroy the Trade of the English.* And what should be the Design of this, says our Author, but *to humble his Subjects!* This was a deep Plot; but would not this humble himself too? Yes, as our Author said before, p. 45. *It was manifest that he was content to be a Vassal to France.* A delicate Receipt to make himself Great and Arbitrary! Here is Malice so feeble and impotent that Lies themselves cannot support it. But observe our Author's old way of making it out. *If we consider,* says he, p. 82. *the Condition in which their present Majesties found the Fleet, the thing will not want Probability.* Suppose many Ships had been lost or decay'd, might not this be by Misfortune or Neglect? There came a List to the Parliament of above thirty Men of War lost, and Eight disabled to Nov. 13. 1691, and will our Author say, this was done on purpose to let the *Dutch* grow great at Sea, and destroy the Trade of the *English*? What would such a malicious *Observer* deserve? Besides, within the foresaid time, above 1000 Merchant Men taken by the *French*, and loss of several *Millions*. Add to this, the Ruin of their Trade by pressing the Seamen out of their Ships, Embargoes, &c. What would our Author infer from the vast Defection

fection of the Seamen for want of Pay and ill Usage under K. W. if it had happen'd in K. J's Time?

But our Author's Invention is either too rank, or he very much misinform'd. For among all K. J's Faults, neglect of the Fleet and Trade were never to bereckon'd. No King better understood, or ever more minded the Affairs of the Fleet, or studied the Encouragement of Trade, so much as he: Witness the noble Store-Houses he built at *Chattam* and other *Ports*; such as *England* never saw before: Nor were the Magazines and Stores ever better provided, than when K. *James* left them; for which I refer this Author to Secretary *Pepy's Memoirs touching the Royal Navy*, Printed in the Year 1690. As likewise to Sir *Peter Pett's* Speech, and the Seamen's Address to the King 1688. I challenge the World to shew such Instances of Frugality, Bounty, and Generosity in any Prince, as Sir *Peter* justly gives in that Speech of that Injur'd Prince K. *James*, and whom our Author so ungraciously and unworthily Calumniates. But he has eas'd his Spleen, and discover'd his poor Intelligence. Let the Reader duly consider upon what sure Grounds he sets down all his *Matters of Fact*, and what regard ought to be had to them.

Our Author had shewn himself a better Politician, if he had turn'd this Charge against K. *James*, by saying, That he was so good a Husband of his Money, that he was able to spare such vast Sums of Money to the Navy, and other publick Works, and yet not demand any Supply from his Subjects, who grew Rich in Trade beyond the Example of former Reigns. This visibly proceeded from his great Care and Application to *Maritime Affairs*, beyond any of his Predecessors. That this would have put him out of the Power of Parliaments, for he would have needed no Money; and by shewing his People, that his Greatness made them thrive and live without Taxes, it would have been a dangerous Temptation

to them to have wisht him *Absolute* while it kept them Rich and Free from Taxes.

But in the Third Edition of this Author's Book, c. 3. s. 6. n. 1. p. 93. there is a *Nota Bene* in the Margin, viz. *That living in another Kingdom and not knowing how much had been expended to the end of K. James's Reign, he was led into this Inference by hearing, that P. O. found no Opposition at Sea, when he came for England. But the preceeding Discourses were exactly related, &c.* Here's a *Recantation* of what he said of K. J's letting the *English Fleet* decay, &c. Tho' by this you are to believe, that this was the only *Erratum* of his Book. But if he would over-hal this Book once more in another Edition it will consist of nothing but *Nota Bene*, for his *Matters of Fact*. His living in another Kingdom will not excuse, but invalidate all he says.

But give me leave to ask this Author a Question. Since you did not know the State of the Navy when K. J. left it, how came you to be so positive in it in your Book? Must not we believe, by this Instance, That you are capable of asserting very positively what you know very little of? Your Confession argues your Guilt. But the Reason you give of your former Mistake is beyond all this, you say, *You were led into this Inference* (viz. of K. James's letting the *English Fleet* decay, on purpose to ruin the Trade of *England*, that the *French* might grow great at Sea) *by hearing that the then P. O. found no Opposition at Sea, when he came for England.* Could there be no other Reason why P. O. found no Opposition at Sea, but K. J's purposely letting the Ships of *England* decay, &c. What if P. O. missed the *English Fleet*? Which was the Case: He found no Opposition at *Salisbury* neither. Our Author might hence as well inter, that K. James purposely let all the *Pikes* and *Guns* in *England* Rot and Rust, &c. Are these Inferences becoming a Man upon his
serious

serious Repentance for his publick Breach of the IX. *Commandment*, and *Slandering* the Footsteps of the Lord's *Anointed*? But he continues to do it still again in Malice that grows ridiculous with it's Rage: For in the next Words after confessing his Mistake, he would have you believe that K. James did own a *Lye* against himself. *But the preceding Discourses of K. James were exactly related.* See his NB. c. 3. f. 6. n. 1. p. 93. Where he tells, *How many Roman Catholicks, who pretended to know his (K. J's) mind, confidently affirm'd, That he purposely let the Ships of England decay and rot, that the French might grow great at Sea, and destroy the Trade of the English — And (says the Author) the King himself could not sometimes forbear Words to the same Purpose.* Now, this our Author, even in his Penitentials affirms to be *exactly related.* But is it probable, that K. J. should himself tell so great a *Lye* against himself, to render himself the most Odious to *England*, that could possible be contrived? All the Aspersions put together, would not *blacken* him half so much in the Eyes of *English Men*, as such a Design to ruin their Trade, on purpose to let the *French* get it. And who can believe a King to be so fond of this Character, as to invent Lies against himself, on purpose to have it believed? But our Author finds a Reason for it. *It was*, says he in his loose Recantation, *to incourage the Irish Nation into the facility of invading England.* And was there no other way to do it, but for the King to tell so scandalous a *Lye* of himself, and which all the *Irish Nobility and Gentry*, as well as *English* knew to be false? This would have been a strange sort of Recommendation!

But if the Care of the Navy, for which K. James was justly admired, shall by our Author be turn'd into the most Invidious Objection against him, what true Representation can be expected from such an

Observer as this? What has this Author to answer for his unjust Representations of K. J. and his Friends?

C. 3. f. 12. n. 6. p. 148. He reflects upon K. James's Sincerity, who in his Answer to the Lords Petition for a Parliament in *England*, Nov. 17. 1688, gave it as one Reason why he could not comply, "Because it was impossible, whilst Part of the Kingdom was in the Enemies Hands, to have a Free Parliament" — From whence our Author infers, *That the same Impossibility lay on him (K. J.) against holding a Parliament in Ireland.* This is barbarous and unjust, to cite Passages thus by halves. K. James tells why a Free Parliament could not be held, in Words undeniable, which our Author basely leaves out, and are these — *And can make a Return of near an Hundred Voices.* If our Author had inserted these Words, he knew it would have ruined his Parallel; for the same Reason that K. J. gave for not calling a Parliament here, would not be so in *Ireland*, where but Two *Boroughs*, *Derry* and *Enniskillen* were in the Enemies Hands, but in *England* the West and other Parts. Now I think all Ingenious Men will allow, that he that does not tell the whole Truth, that is material, is a *false* Witness. What is our Author then? But for the present, I shall only say this, That where this our Author seems most exact and sets his Quotation, as you would think, *Verbatim*, in the Margin, there you are chiefly to suspect him; and you must stand upon your Guard: Another Instance of which we have c. 1. n. 6. in a Quotation of his out of *Grotius de Jure*, &c. l. 2. c. 25. n. 8. to shew, That tho' Subjects might not take Arms lawfully, even in the extreme Neccessity — it would not follow from thence, that others might not take Arms in their behalf. I know no body that says it would follow from thence. But as to his Quotation, *Grotius* says in the very same Place:

Place: That this pretence of helping others has been the pretence to invade their Neighbour's Right; and that mere Possession does not give a Right; for Pirates and Robbers get things by Force. All this our Author has wisely left out; because it would have spoil'd his Design. But I cannot imagine for what end he sets down another Quotation of *Grotius*, l. 2. c. 20. §. 40 *That it is so much the more Honourable to avenge the Injuries done to another, than our selves, by how much there is less Danger, that the Sense of another's Pain should make us exceed in exacting such Revenge, than of our own, or Byass our Judgment.* By this Rule, he that revenges the Injuries done to another, must have no *by Ends*, else it may make him exceed in his revenge, *viz.* Instead of reducing his Neighbour to Reason, to seize upon all he has for himself.

If Provocations can justify extraordinary Resentment, K. *James* had enough to render him that cruel, merciless Tyrant our Author has represented him; but after all this Noise, to find that this Bloody Monster has kill'd none of these People, and not only refus'd to do it himself, but kept back others from doing it? Who would believe K. *J* determin'd *our Ruin*? Or how can our Author answer this unfair Treatment of his Prince? Truly give him his due he never wants a Reason, tho' a bad one, and out it must. Why, this *Clemency* of K. *James* in not doing all this was *Policy*, Interest, he would not provoke *England*. How does this consist with his former Representation. People that strain the Truth are under a Necessity of Contradicting themselves sometimes. You know who should have good Memories. But when a Cause carries different Aspects, it runs a Man sometimes into Bespattering that Side he means to Defend. Thus he Affronts the Government, in saying, When *England* found the Old Oath of *Supremacy* inconsistent

sistent with the present *Settlement*, they wisely Abrogated it, and made a new One. I forbear to insist on our Author's Jesuitical Prevarications in this, because I would not be tedious, and shall only hint, That he will rather Wound the present Government, than miss an Opportunity of having a Stroke of K. *James*.

There were several Proclamations in 1690, both in *Ireland* and *England* against Papists and reputed Papists, as you may see in *London Gaz.* N. 2568. Which our Author takes upon him to condemn, as a Breach of the Liberty of the Subjects, &c. p. 95. where he inveighs against a Proclamation of K. *J.*s dated 26. *July* 1689, which confin'd all Protestants to their Parishes and Cities (close Confinement!) as a very great Encroachment upon their Liberty, and a mighty Inconvenience to their Affairs. This he urges against K. *J.* which will lye equally against all Kings in Time of War.

P. 121. n. 6. He charges the *Irish* with taking Free Quarters. p. 132. n. 3. Assessing the Protestants for maintaining their *Mil'tia*, p. 178. n. 5. making the Penalty of the Proclamations for bringing in Arms, &c. to be Death; p. 209. turning the Protestant Churches into Lodging Places, defacing and burning the Movables of them, &c. In every of which particulars, the Protestant Army by many Degrees out-did that of K. *J.*s, if the *Irish* Protestants are to be credited. K. *W.* by his Proclamations dated 31 *July* 1690, for the Papists bringing in their Arms makes the Penalty, to be treated, as Traytors and Rebels, and be left to the Discretion of his Soldiers.

Our Author does not alledge that any Protestant in *Ireland* was put to Death by K. *J.* for not bringing in his Arms. Nor will he say, that they did all bring in their Arms; but confesses, as you have heard before, that they kept so many, as were sufficient

ficient to have *Fought the Irish, and beat them too*. Now the use I have to make of it is, that this Author wounds K. W. in the Person of K. James; for both Proclamations were to the same purpose. In K. W. it's nothing; but in K. J. it is *Tyranny and illegal Oppression*; condemning that in one which he justifies in another.

What he says, p. 130. n. 4. of the Protestants being forc'd to take out Protections, and pay for them, and then have them recall'd, and paying for new ones in another, is down-right Lampooning the Government at that time in *Ireland*; who forc'd all the *Irish* to take Protections and pay for them, and then recall them, and put it into other Hands, to grant new Protections over and over again. In *March 1690*, all Protections were recall'd, except those granted by the General, and all required to take new Ones from the Judges of Assize, at 12 *d.* a piece, and I have been told that in County of *Meath* there were Ten or Twelve Thousand Protections given. A comfortable Circuit!

Our Author infers from the *Irish* being kill'd with K. J's Protection in their Pockets, that they were kill'd by the King's Approbation. This is his usual way of arguing! But supposing he had such a Story to tell of K. James's Officers in *Ireland* as that of *Glencoe*, how easily could he make it reflect upon the King himself, and absolve all the *High-landers* from their Allegiance, and give them leave to protect their Lives another way? What Declamations should we have of *Irish Cut-throats, Massacrers, &c.* And what use would he have made of their giving it under their Hands, that what they did was by the King's express Command, and none punish'd for it! He would have made more of this than of all the Stories he has Collected in his Book, if they were all True.

His Zeal must be commended, p. 206. n. 8. where he reckons as a Means of Destroying the Protestant Religion the Debauchery and universal Corruption of Manners that then prevail'd. They are indeed a means to destroy any Religion : But that these were encreas'd beyond former Examples in K. W's Army, all that have the least Sense of Religion do bemoan with regret. *Can we* (says Dr. Gorge in his Letter) *expect Sodom to destroy Babylon, or Debauchery to destroy Popery? Our Enemy* (says he) *Fights with the Principle of a mistaken Conscience against us, we against the Conviction of our Principles against them.*

When our Author speaks, p. 173. against Gen. Rosen's Stratagem of driving the Protestants before Derry, ought at the same time to have the World told how the King resented that Barbarity ; sending expresse Orders to all Governors and Commanders of Towns and Places to forbear such Practices. This several Officers have told me to whom such Orders were sent. This was only intended by Gen. Rosen : But what does our Author think of the Driving the Irish, Men, Women, and Children over the Shannon to starve them ; this was executed so strictly that several Officers expresse'd their Regret at it, and were asham'd of their Commissions ; and those that were thus driven had K. W's Protection in their Pockets. Thus our Author Wounds the Government thro' the Sides of the Irish.

Having shewn our Author in several Capacities, we now present him to you under that of a *Common-wealthmans* He says, p. 4, That certain and infallible Destruction will be brought to *England*, as it was to *Rome*, and in a great Measure to *Florence*, if ever the Prerogative do swallow up the *Liberties and Privileges of the Subject*. p. 77. That their choosing their own Representatives is the only Barrier they have against the *Encroachments of their Governor*, p. 57. That it is the Kingdom's Money

Money that pays the Soldiers, p. 57. That the Abuses in the Kingdom proceeded from the long disuse of Parliaments, p. 133. n. 6. He would limit the Prerogative, giving the King a Power to change or coin Money with the Assent of Parliaments. Surely he has heard of *Leather Money* coin'd in *England*, and *Past-board* in *Holland*.

But this is not so pleasant a Prospect as the *Passive-Obedience Men* afford us, while they represent the Prerogative as the greatest Safe-guard of the Rights and Privileges of the People, and therefore to be lov'd by the People, and kept Great and Inviolable, as their greatest Security and Glory.

It is time to come to a Conclusion. I will therefore close this Discourse with a small Reflection on this Author's Conclusion, p. 239. Wherein he protests before God, That he has not *Aggravated*, or *Mis-represented* the Proceedings against us, out of Favour or Affection to a Party, &c. But if this had been his Principle, why would he lay such Loads upon a Popish King for choosing to trust Papists in his Army, rather than Protestants? Is it not the same Reason, as for a Protestant Prince to desire a Protestant Army? Our Author knows this was K. J's Case with the *Irish*.

I am very sensible of the many ill Steps were made in K. J's Government, and, above all of the mischievous Consequence of the Lord *Tyrconnel's* Administration, which, the most of any thing, brought on his Master's Misfortunes. But when K. J. was deserted by the *English*, and the Protestants in *Ireland*, no Man in his Senses can blame him for making use of the *Irish*, and the Lord *Tyrconnel*. This was the Opinion of my Lord chief Justice *Keating*, as inserted by our Author, p. 349. And this Author knows very well that Lord chief Justice *Keating* was a firm Protestant, and a Man of Sense.

Our Author confesses p. 101. n. 5. That new Officers were made partly on the noise of P. O's Defect, and partly in the beginning of *Decemb. 1688.* And yet he blackens K. J. and says p. 166. *That without any Necessity at all he threw himself upon these People, arming them and giving them Commissions, &c.* I think the necessity and reason of this all Men will allow, for he had none others to throw himself upon there.

But does not our Author *Aggravate* the Case (which he protests before God he does not) when he assures us, p. 15. *That K. James did prosecute the same, if not worse Methods towards the Protestants in Ireland, than the K. of France did with the Hugonots in his Dominions.* This you must know was what our Author, c. 3. f. 8. n. 15. p. 112. calls *Dragooning*, perfect terrible *Dragooning* ! And yet it was no *Dragooning* neither. In short the whole Matter was disarming the Protestants in *Dublin 24 Dec. 1688.* and reason good, when all the Protestants in *Ireland* (except *Dublin* and other parts of *Linster*, which the Lord Deputy kept in awe) were actually in Arms, and had entred into *Associations* to carry on the War. Our Author calling this *Dragooning* betrays his Cause, and renders all he says suspected; and to aggravate things beyond Truth, does not make them more, but nothing at all. Those that have read Monsieur *Claud's* Account of the Persecution of the *Hugonots*, and should hear our Author say K. James treated the *Irish* Protestants worse, would be apt to think him a strange Man indeed.

But after all this *Blackening* and *Mis-representing* K. J. our Author's grand Topick, viz. That K. J. intended the Destruction of his People, must fall; for rather than destroy them, he put it in their Power to destroy him; which they did without the least Sense of his Goodness to them. Dr. Gorge in his Letter assures us, that the *Irish* Protestants were more active against K. James, than any of K. W's Army.

And

And it is as certain, that his Mercy to those disloyal Wretches put them in a Capacity to help drive him out of the Kingdom.

Our Author has painted K. J. blacker than the K^{ing} of *France*, as you have heard; but I appeal to him, whether he would have thought himself so secure in K. *Lewis's* Hands, if he had been betraying his Councils, and giving Intelligence to his Enemies, as he was, under these Circumstances, in K. *James's* Power.

But he does not stick here; K. *James* must be represented more inhumane than the Great Turk, c. 3. f. 20. n. 7. p. 224. *The Usage we met with*, (says the Author) *being full as inhumane as any thing the Christians under the Slavery of the Turk suffer.*

What Cruelty would not a Man expect from this Representation. And yet to call God to Witness, that this is not *Aggravating* nor *Mis-representing*! The Address of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, &c. of *Dublin* to K. *W.* says, *That the Sufferings of the Protestants there under K. James did infinitely surpass an Egyptian Servitude.* This is the only Match our Author has met with. They were resolv'd to out do the *Clergy-Address* of their own City, spoke by the Bishop of *Meath*; in which he modestly Confesses to K. *W.* that K. *James* was able to crush the Protestants far worse than he did. But Secretary Gorge in his Letter tells in plain *English*, what the Bishop so gentilely minc'd. *The King* (K. *James*) *is much averse*, says he, *to all Severity*, yet clearly sees he can make no Impression of Loyalty on them. Notwithstanding, continues the Letter, *He often gave Command to his Officers, that in their Engagements with the English, they should be treated as mistaken Subjects, and not as obstinate Rebels.* Yet these were his bitterest Enemies as you have seen. And tho' themselves Confess, that he us'd them with less Severity than they deserv'd at his Hands; yet to hear

hear them complain of *Egyptian Servitude*, to cry out upon him as a Tyrant infinitely surpassing *Pharaoh*, the *Turk*, or the *French King* (whom some are made to believe is the worst of the Three) is Ridiculous and Wicked. This is bending a Bow till it breaks, to heap up Calumnies, and Aggravate them till they become incredible. And the Consequence is not only Disbelieving what Pieces of Truth may be told in this Book of our Author. But if *Protestants* do own and countenance it as a true Narrative of the Affairs of *Ireland* in this *Revolution*, it may bring into Question their true Relations of the Horrible and Bloody *Massacre* of 41: Monsieur *Claud's* Account of the *French* Persecution, and whatever is written by *Protestants*. It is a Discredit to Mankind, and brings any Party whatever into Disreputation. How have Legends Scandaliz'd the Veracity of the *Roman Church*? No Cause is long serv'd by Deceit. Honesty is the best Policy! Let us not be afraid to Confess our Faults, nor desire to enlarge those of our Enemies. No doubt there are Errors on both sides. But to persist in our Error, and to defend it, is the Devil's Part. Therefore in the Name of God, let Truth prevail: And let all the People say, *AMEN.*

F I N I S.

